

A

# DISCOURSE

## Advertisement.

**I**F any Gentlemen or Gentlewomen have a mind to learn French or Latin, the Author will wait upon them. He has made two Grammars, whereby they may speedily attain to these Languages. He lives now in *Water-lane Fleetstreet* at *Mr. Baldwin's* next door to the *Half-moon Tavern.*

L O N D O N

Printed by William Knapman for the  
Author, and are to be sold by  
Mr. Duckman at Alderman's  
coffee over against St. Dunstons  
house 1700.

A

# DISCOURSE

## Advertisement.

**I**F any Gentlemen or Gentlewomen have a mind to learn French or Latin, the Author will wait upon them. He has made two Grammars, whereby they may speedily attain to these Languages. He lives now in *Water-lane Fleetstreet* at *Mr. Baldwin's* next door to the *Half-moon Tavern*.

L O N D O N

Printed by William Knapman for the  
Author, and are to be sold by  
Mr. Duckman at Alderman's  
coffee over against St. Dunstons  
house 1700.



A

# DISCOURSE

I. Of the Trinity, and Divinity of Jesus Christ the Son of God, and of the Holy Ghost, clearly prov'd against *Arians* and *Socinians*, with an Answer to their chiefest Objections.

II. Of God's Existence, against *Atheists*.

III. Of the certainty of the holy Scriptures, against *Libertines*.

IV. Of the Immortality of our Souls, against *Epicureans*.

V. Of Physick, Metaphysick, and Astronomy, for the use of them, who have no time to read the great and intangled Volumes of Philosophers.

---

By *Peter Berault,*

Chaplain of His Majesty's Ships  
the *Kent* and *Victory* in the  
late War with *France*.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed by *William Redmayne* for the  
Author, and are to be Sold by  
*Mr. Duchemin* at *Abraham's Sa-*  
*crifice* over against *Somerset-*  
*house*. 1700.

# Dedication

Judge of these Articles of  
Faith, which I do here en-  
deavour to prove, both by the  
Authority of the holy Scrip-  
tures, and several Reasons  
deduced from them. I have  
afterwards attempted to con-  
vince the sceptics of God's  
Existence; the Existence of  
the certainty of the holy Scrip-  
tures; and the immutability  
of the laws of Nature.



I am, Sir,  
Your humble servant,  
James O. S. J.  
to well known, some of the  
learned, and Orthodox;  
and who by your great  
Zeal

Dedication.

~~Zeal for the Protestant Re-~~

ligion, carried the Cause for  
the Bishops against a vio-

lence Right Honourable  
thereby greatly contributing

JOHN

Lord SOMMERS

Baron of Evesham.

My Lord,

THE Arians, Sacri-  
nians, Atheists, In-  
bertines, and Epicu-  
reans, which are the chief  
Subject of this Discourse,  
have hitherto very much in-  
fected

## Dedication.

fecting the World: the former with their pernicious Errors, and the latter with their lewd, wicked and Scandalous Manners. The *Arians* were once so Proud as to boast openly that all the World was turned *Arian*; and the *Socinians* are now so confident as to brag in all places, that the greatest part of Christians are at this time of their Opinion. I was lately engag'd in Disputation with some of 'em; which occasioned me to set down my Arguments, and their strongest Objections, that the Reader may impartially judge

*Dedication.*

judge of these Articles of Faith, which I do here endeavour to prove, both by the Authority of the holy Scriptures, and several Reasons deduced from them. I have afterwards attempted to convince the *Atheists* of God's Existence; the *Libertines* of the certainty of the holy Scriptures; and the *Epicureans* of the Immortality of their Souls.

I am assured, My Lord, when they see here your Name; whose Character is so well known to be Pious, Learned, and Orthodox; and who, by your great Zeal

*Dedication.*

Zeal for the Protestant Religion, carried the Cause for the Bishops against a violent Popish Faction, and thereby greatly contributing to this present happy Revolution both in Church and State, was as a consequence thereof most deservedly created Lord High Chancellor of England. This, I think, will prove a powerful Motive to induce them to persevere in it, and even to forsake not only their Errors, but their corrupted Manners also. This is the chiefest reason, which moved me to dedicate it to your Lordship.

I could

*Dedication.*

I could enumerate here  
your eminent Qualities; but,  
to avoid Prolixity, I shall  
only say, that Virtue is al-  
ways followed with Envy;  
and therefore to see virtuous  
Men in high Places, in sin-  
gular favour with their Prince,  
and have then Enemies, is  
to me no greater wonder,  
than to see Bodies pursued  
with shadows, when the  
Sun shines upon them. But  
Virtue shall prevail; and,  
in spite of all who are dis-  
affected to you, will ever  
preserve your Name from  
Oblivion, and render it glo-  
rious to all succeeding Ages.

Your



### *Dedication.*

Your Lordship knows, that  
all Men are Subject to many  
Troubles in their Bodys, Im-  
ployments and Souls. Man,  
saith Job, is born to trouble as  
the sparks fly upwards. Many  
are the troubles of the righteous,  
saith David; and St. Paul  
tells us, that we must through  
much Tribulation enter into the  
Kingdom of Heaven. I humb-  
ly intreat God Almighty to  
Sanctifie yours in this World,  
and in the other to Crown them  
all with an Immortal Glory;  
which is the earnest Prayer  
of him, that is truly

Your Lordship's  
Most Humble, Most Obedient,  
and Affectionate Servant

P. Berault.

Dedication.

Y our I ordship knows, that  
all Men are Subjects to  
Thee in their Bodies, In-  
ployments and Soules.  
Ist. I hope I shall be able  
the more to serve thee.

# MONSIEUR SOMMERS.

## EPIGRAMME.

**S**ÇAVANT SOMMERS! tes-Ennemis  
Aussi bien que tous tes Amis,  
Confessent, qu'il est veritable,  
Que ton Pais t'est redevable.  
S'il jouit à present d'une Religion  
Pure, & sans Superstition;  
Si l'Eglise Romaine Idolatre, Heretique,  
Persecutrice, & Tyrannique  
Luy ne regne plus: Si sa Loy,  
S'il a sa Liberte, sa Foy,  
Qui doit-il remercier? Le Roy Guillaume, &c.

P. BEAULT.

P. Beault.

A  
MONSIEUR  
BERAULT

SUR SON LIVRE.

EPIGRAMME.

**H**Elas ! dans le temps où nous sommes  
Nous voyons que l'Impiété,  
La Debauche, l'Erreur, l'Envie & Cruauté  
Regnent dans la plupart des Hommes.  
Ils disent que la Trinité  
N'est point dans la Sainte Ecriture,  
Que là n'est point la vérité  
Que tout est fait par la Nature ;  
Qu'il n'est point de Divinité,  
Ni d'Âmes d'Immortalité.  
Mais BERAULT fait voir en son Livre,  
Le contraire si clairement  
Que celui qui dit autrement,  
Il faut ou qu'il soit Fol, ou du moins qu'il soit Iuste.

P. E. B. D.

~~MONSIEUR~~

THE  
BEREANS  
TRINITY  
AND

DIVINITY

*Of Jesus Christ the Son of  
God, and of the Holy Ghost,  
clearly proved against Arians  
and Socinians, with an An-  
swer to their chiefest Objec-  
tions.*

THE Bereans were high-  
ly commended by St.  
Paul. Act. 17. 11. be-  
cause they searched the  
Scriptures daily, whether those  
B things,

2 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

things, which he did teach, were true or no. This Inquiry after Truth is enjoined unto us by Jesus Christ. *Search the Scriptures*, saith he, John 5. 39. *for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.* And Mat. 22. 29. He seems to attribute all our Errors to the Ignorance of that sacred Book, when he saith to the Sadduces, *ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures.* Had the *Arians* and *Socinians* either well known, or impartially read the Holy Scriptures, they should have found there the Holy Trinity, and Divinity of Jesus Christ the Son of God and of the holy Ghost, which I shall now endeavour to shew them both plainly and briefly in this Treatise. I will neither make here mention of Fathers, nor of Councils, because they are both rejected by our Adversaries ;

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 3*  
saries ; I will only quote the holy  
Scripture, which they grant to be  
true ; and from thence, either  
by express words, or by necessary  
consequences, prove these three  
Articles of our Christian Reli-  
gion.

Although this word *Trinity*  
be not found in the holy Scrip-  
tures by express and distinct  
words ; yet it is inferred from  
'em by clear and necessary con-  
sequences. For we read that  
there is but one God ; and that  
the Father is God, that the Son  
is God, that the Holy Ghost is  
God ; and consequently that there  
is a Trinity. For by this word  
*Trinity* we mean three eternal  
and infinite Persons subsisting in  
one and the same Numerical Na-  
ture or Godhead.

That there is but one God,  
we are convinced of it by our rea-  
son ; and this is declared in se-

#### 4 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

veral places of the holy Scriptures, *Deu. 6. 4. The Lord our God is our Lord, Deu. 4. 35. There is none else besides him, Mar. 12. 32. There is one God, and there is none other but he.*

That the Father is God, is granted by the Arians and Socinians, and prov'd by these words of *St. Paul 1. Cor. 8. 6. But unto us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, Ephes. 4. 6. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in y<sup>e</sup> all. This is also declared in the Apostles Creed, when we say, I believe in God the Father Almighty maker of Heaven and Earth.*

That the Son is God, is manifest by these words of *St. Paul, Rom. 9. 5. And of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever. 1 Tim. 3. 16. Great is the Mystery of*



*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 5*  
of Godliness, God was manifested  
in the Flesh. John 1. 2. 3. In  
the beginning was the word, and  
the word was with God, and the  
word was God; the same was in the  
beginning with God, all things were  
made by him, and without him was  
not any thing made that was made.  
Phil. 2. 6. who being in the form  
of God, thought it not robbery to be  
equal with God. If he be equal  
with God, then he is God, for  
no Creature can be equal with  
God.

That the Holy Ghost is God al-  
so, is evident by these words of  
the Acts 5. 3. 4. Wherein St.  
Peter saith to Ananias, that to  
lye to the Holy Ghost, is to lye unto  
God. For, when St. Peter saith;  
thou hast not lyed unto Men, but  
unto God, 'tis the same as if he  
should say, thou hast not lyed un-  
to Creatures but unto him, that  
is no Creature, and consequently

## 6 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

true God. This is manifested also by the Divine Attributes ascribed unto him, as Omniscience and Sanctification of Souls.

And that there is a *Trinity*, or three Persons in the God-head, is plain by these words of St. *Matthew* 28. 29. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And more evidently by those of the 1 Epistle of St. *John* 5. 7. *There are Three, that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* For to think concerning the first Text, which we make use of in our Baptism, that the Son and the Holy Ghost would be joyned together in that solemn devoting our selves to God, and professing the Christian Faith, if they were only Creatures, is a very great absurdity. And since it is revealed in  
the

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 7*

the holy Scriptures, that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost God, as I have already made it appear, and will be more clearly seen hereafter, we are bound to believe it; for all that is revealed by God is true.

That *these three are one*, as we read in the other Text, is the only thing in Scripture, that sounds as a Contradiction. Some would therefore throw out that passage, and are willing to find some Copies without it. But our Saviour saith. *John 10. 30. That he and his Father are one.* And if two be one, then three may be one also.

1. Objection. By the word *Trinity*, you mean, say the *Arians* and *Socinians*, three eternal and infinite Persons, really distinct one from another, and subsisting in one and the same numerical Substance or Nature. But this is contrary to humane reason.  
For

### 8 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

For as it is contrary to humane reason, that *Peter, Paul and John*, who are three really distinct Persons, have but one numerical Substance or Nature; so it is contrary to reason, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost should be three really distinct Persons, and have notwithstanding but one numerical Substance or Nature. For from three Persons, three Substances or Natures do naturally result. Which is prov'd thus.

Person in God is either a Being or nothing: we cannot say it is nothing, because the three Divine Persons should then be nothing at all; therefore it must needs be a Being. If a Being, either it is real or mental: we cannot call it mental, because *sublatio Intellectus* the Person should be no more. It remains therefore that it is a real Being. If real, either it is a Substance or an Accident;

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost* 9  
cident ; for there is no Medium  
between them. We cannot call  
it an Accident, because we admit  
none in the God-head, for the  
great absurdities which do follow  
from thence. Therefore it must  
needs be a Substance. And if a  
Substance, since there are three  
really distinct Persons in the God-  
head, it follows that there are  
three really distinct Substances,  
and consequently three Gods,  
which is both contrary to reason  
and holy Scriptures.

Answer. First I say that the  
*Trinity* is not contrary to humane  
reason. And that you may be  
the better convinced of it, you  
must consider two things in the  
blessed *Trinity*, *quod sit*, and *quo-  
modo sit* ; its Existence and the  
manner of it. As for its Existence,  
it is not contrary to reason, be-  
cause God has reveal'd it ; for all  
that is revealed by God is true,  
and

10 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*  
and consequently not contrary  
to reason. But as for the manner  
of it, or how it is, I must confess  
with all learned Men, that it is  
above the reach of our reason,  
and cannot be comprehended by  
any Creature whatsoever; be-  
cause, as saith *Thomas Aquinas* q.  
32. Art 1. in Conc. by natural  
reason we cannot come to the Know-  
ledge of God but by Creatures, which  
lead us to the knowledge of God as  
effects to their Cause. Therefore  
by natural reason that only may be  
known of God, which by necessity be-  
longs to him as he is the Principle  
of all things. But the power of  
Creating in God is common to the  
whole Trinity, therefore it belongs  
to the unity of Essence, and not to  
the distinction of Persons. We may  
then by reason know the things be-  
longing to the unity of the Essence  
of God, but not the things belonging  
to the distinction of Persons.

We

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 11*

We are certain that there is a *Trinity*; for we are certain that the Father is God, that the Son is God, that the Holy Ghost is God; and yet that there is but one God, because it is so revealed in the holy Scripture. But we cannot conceive how can that be, because it did not please God to make it manifest unto us. As long as we shall be in this World we may know *quod sit Trinitas*, but we shall not know *quomodo sit*. That is, we may know that there is a *Trinity*, but we cannot apprehend how it is; that is reserved for the other World. For now, saith St. Paul 1 Cor. 13. 12. *we see through a Glass darkly, but then Face to Face. We are*, saith the same Apostle 2 Cor. 10. 5. *to cast down Imaginations, and every high thing, that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, bringing into Captivity every thought to the obedience*  
of



12 *Of the Trinity and Divinity of Christ.* And 2 Cor. 5. 7. *he saith that we walk by Faith, not by sight.*

**There** are things that we know by Faith alone, and others by Faith and Reason. The holy *Trinity*, Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and Resurrection of our bodies are of the first sort; we cannot know them but by Faith only. But as for God's Existence, his Unity, Immensity, Omnipresence, Almighty Power, and his other Attributes, we know them both by Reason and Faith. For, saith St. Paul, Rom. 1. 20. *The invisible things of him from the Creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and God-head.* And Heb. 11. 6. *He speaks thus, He that comes to God must believe that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.*

There

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 13*

There is this difference between natural and Christian Religion: in the natural Religion we believe nothing but what is apprehended by our reason: but in the Christian we believe many things, which we cannot conceive by the strength of our Reason. Such are the *Trinity*, Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Resurrections of our Bodys. Christians are to submit their Reason to these Articles of Faith, though they cannot clearly understand them. In these Reason has nothing to do; we are to be determined by Faith, whose nature is always obscure.

And if we believe the Creation of the World, and Resurrection of our Bodies, because they are revealed in the holy Scriptures, though we cannot clearly apprehend them; For how can we apprehend that of nothing something

C

14 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

thing is made; for it is an Axiome receiv'd amongst Philosophers, that *ex nihilo nihil fit*. And how can we conceive that our Bodys, which are rotten and reduced to ashes, shall come to Life again; for it is another Axiome receiv'd in Philosophy, that *ex privatione ad habitum non datur regressus*. Yet we do believe one and the other, because they are revealed in the holy Scriptures. Why then shall we not believe the blessed *Trinity*, seeing it is revealed in the Sacred Writ, though we cannot clearly apprehend how it is.

There are many Things in Nature, which we cannot well comprehend, though they be very true; as the Flux and Re-flux of the Sea; how our Bodies are curiously wrought in the Womb; how Light darts itself in a moment from Heaven to Earth; how it causes vision in the eye; how

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 15*

how so vast a number of Objects are received into that small Room at once; and many other things, which it would be too long to relate. And if we cannot comprehend these things, which are but natural; how shall we pretend to comprehend the Divine and Supernatural things, and especially the blessed *Trinity*, which is counted to be incomprehensible, and of which we may say, Rom. 11. 13. *O the depth of the Riches both of wisdom and knowledge of God, how unsearchable are his Judgments, and his ways p<sup>r</sup>-st finding out.*

It is above the reach of our Reason, I grant it; but not contrary to our Reason. If we should say that three Gods in one and the same respect are but one God, it would be a Contradiction. But to say that three eternal and infinite Persons or Substances have but one and the same Divine Nature,

16 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

there lies no Contradiction. And this is that the Fathers and Councils have said, and the Church of *England* does believe concerning the blessed *Trinity*.

Secondly I say, that though it be contrary to reason, that *Peter*, *Paul* and *John*, who are three really distinct Persons, have but one numerical Nature; nevertheless it is not contrary to reason that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, who are three really distinct Persons, have but one numerical Nature or Substance. For it is otherwise in Divine than humane Persons. In humane Persons *Peter*, *Paul* and *John* have every one a Numerical Nature distinct one from the other; but it is not so in divine Persons; for what God has revealed is true, and consequently cannot be contrary to reason. But God has revealed, as I have prov'd by the authority  
of

*Of 3. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 17*

of the holy Scriptures, that though the Father be God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, yet there is but one God; *Ergo* it necessarily follows that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, or the three divine Persons have but one Numerical Substance or Nature.

2. Objection. The *Trinity*, say the *Arians* and *Socinians*, is neither found distinctly in the holy Scriptures, nor can be inferred from 'em by clear and necessary Consequences; therefore there is no such thing as *Trinity*. The former proposition is without any dispute; for if ye read over the Old and New Testament ye shall no where find this word *Trinity*. And the latter is prov'd thus.

If the *Trinity* be inferred from the holy Scriptures, by clear and necessary consequences, it must needs be in this Text of the first Epistle of St. John. 5. 7. *There*

18 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

*are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the word and the Holy Ghost, and these three one.*

But in this Text, though mention be made of the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, and consequently of three Persons; because the Father is a Person, the Word or the Son a Person, and the Holy Ghost a Person; yet we cannot clearly infer, that these three Persons have but one Numerical Nature or Substance. Because by these words, *and these three are one*, we may very well understand an unity of will, of agreement and Spirit, and not of Nature or Substances. So that when it is said, *there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*; it is as we should say, these three are one in mind, they do agree one with another, what one willeth, the other willeth also.



also. And this is confirmed by these words of St. *John*, wherein it is said, that Jesus Christ prayeth his Father, that we may be one as he is one with his Father; that is, that we may do what he will have us to do, as he doth what his Father will have him to do. Every one may clearly see that we are not, nor can be one in a Numerical Nature with his Son Jesus Christ, this being contrary to reason. Therefore we cannot infer by a clear and necessary consequence, that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost have but one Numerical Nature or Substance. Therefore the *Trinity* is neither distinctly found in the holy Scriptures, nor can be deduced from 'em by clear and necessary Consequences.

Answer. First I grant that the word *Trinity* is not distinctly found in the holy Scriptures; but

## 20 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

I maintain that it is inferred from 'em by clear and necessary consequences. For I have prov'd by the sacred Writ that the Father is God, that the Son is God, that the Holy Ghost is God, and yet that there is but one God; and therefore I have prov'd that there is a *Trinity*: for by the word *Trinity* we mean three Persons or Subsistences having but one Numerical Divine Nature or Substance.

Secondly, I say that by these words of St. *John*, *and these three are one*, is not meant an unity of mind, agreement and will, as the *Arians* and *Socinians* maintain, but an unity of Substance as it clearly appears by these words of St. *John* 10. 30. *I and my Father are one*; For had he only an unity of will, of love and agreement, he should not be called *the only begotten Son of God, the true God, Eternal Life, God blessed over all*  
fr

Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 21  
for ever. John 1. 14. 1. John 5.  
20. Rom. 9. 5. He should not be  
called the brightness of the glory of  
his Father, and the expresse Image  
of his Person. Heb. 1. 3. And we  
should not read of him Phil. 2. 6.  
That he, being in the form of God,  
thought it not robbery to be equal  
with God. We should not read.  
Col. 2. 3. That in him are hid  
all the treasures of wisdom and  
knowledge. And Col. 2. 9. That  
in him dwells all the fulness of the  
God head bodily. We should not  
read. Col. 1. 16. 17. That by  
him were all things Created that  
are in Heaven, or that are in earth  
visible and invisible, whether they  
be Thrones, or Dominions, or Prin-  
cipalities, or Powers. And John  
1. 3. That all things were made  
by him, and without him was not  
any thing made that was made. We  
should not read of him. Heb. 1.  
2. 3. That he made the worlds,  
that

22 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

*that he is the Heir of all things, and upholds all things by the word of his power. St. Peter would not have said of him. John 21. 17. That he knows all things. It should not be said of him. John 5. 21. That as the Father raises up the dead, and quickens them, even so the Son quickens whom he will. Neither should it be said of him, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.*

And since by these passages of the holy Scripture, and many others, which I do not quote here, not only the Name of the true God, which cannot be proper to a Creature, but also the essential Attributes of the Godhead are ascribed unto the Son; it follows by a clear and necessary consequence, that he has an unity of substance with his Father. For he that is *the only Son, and the only begotten Son*, has no Partner  
or

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost.* 23  
or Sharer in that Son-ship ascribed unto him. But Christ is the only Son; and the only begotten Son of God, as it is evident in St. *John* 1. 14. *Ergo* he has no Partner or Sharer in that Son-ship ascribed unto him. *Ergo* he has an unity of Substance or Nature with his Father. For had he only an unity of Mind, Love, Agreement or Adoption, he should have Sharers and Partners. Therefore when he is called *the only Son, the only begotten Son*, it is because of his unity of substance with his Father.

3. Objection. If the Son have an unity of substance with his Father, it necessarily follows, say the *Arians* and *Socinians*, that he is really and properly true God.

• But He cannot be really and properly true God; *Ergo* he has not an unity of substance with his Father.

## 24 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

Father. The *Minor* is prov'd thus out of the holy Scriptures. *There is no other God but one.* 1 Cor. 8. 4. The Lord of *Israel* is that true God, for *there is none else besides him,* Deu. 4. 35. The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is that true God. For *John* 17. 3. *This is Eternal Life that they may know Thee, O Father, the only true God.* And 1 Cor. 8. 16. St. Paul speaks thus. *For though there be that are calledd Gods, whether in Heaven or Earth, as there be Lords many and Gods many; but to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.*

And if according to what saith St. Paul, *though there be many, that are called Gods and Lords, nevertheless there is but one true God, and one true Lord.* And if according to what Jesus Christ saith,

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 25*

faith, his Father is the only true God; it follows that Christ or the Son of God is not really and properly true God, and consequently that he has not an unity of substance with his Father.

Answer. To these words of St. John, *This is Eternal Life, that they might know thee, O Father, the only true God*; I say that by the only true God, is meant God *à se*; and in that sense the Father is the only true God, because he only is God *à se*. That is, He only is the Origine of the God-head. He is called the only true God, not exclusively, but eminently and by way of excellency, by which the Name and the Title of God is peculiarly predicated of God the Father, because he is the Origine of the God-head. But the Son is not God *à se*, but God of God, for he is begotten of his Father.

D

And

## 26 Of the Trinity and Divinity

And to these words of St. Paul, *though there be that are called Gods &c.* I say, that as nothing can hinder the Father to be Lord, though it be said, *there is but one Lord Jesus Christ*; so nothing can hinder Jesus Christ or the Son of God to be true God, though it be written, *There is but one God the Father.*

4. Objection. If the Son were really and properly true God, he should have the knowledge of all things.

But he has not the knowledge of all things, since he doth not know the day and hour of Judgment.

*Ergo* he is not really and properly true God. The Major Proposition is certain, and the Minor is prov'd thus. *Mat. 24. 36. But of that day and hour, saith Christ, knows no man, no not the Angels of heaven, but my Father only.*  
And



*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 27*

And *Mark 13. 32.* We read,  
*But of that day and that hour knows  
no Man, no not the Angels which  
are in Heaven, neither the Son, but  
the Father.* Wherefore if the Fa-  
ther only knows the day and hour  
of Judgment, and the Son doth  
not know it, it follows that he has  
not the knowledge of all things,  
and consequently that he is not  
really and properly true God;  
for to the true God nothing can be  
unknown.

Answer. I grant that Jesus  
Christ the Son of God, according  
to his humane Nature, knew not  
the day and hour of Judgment,  
as he knew not *Lazarus's* sepul-  
cher, when he asked his Sisters,  
where they had hid him; and  
as he knew not what the two  
Disciples were talking of by  
the way, when he said unto  
them, *Luk. 24. 17. What man-*

28 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*  
*ner of Conversation are these*  
*that ye have one to another; And*  
as he knew not whether *Peter* loved him more than the rest of his Disciples, when he said unto him the Third time, *lovest thou me?* But as he was God, he knew all things. For *Col. 2. 3. in him are hid all the treasures of Wisdom and knowledge,* and as it appears by these words of *St. Peter, Thou knowest all things. John 21. 17. and 16. 19.*

If according to these Texts of the holy Scripture, he knows all things; *ergo* he knows the day and hour of Judgment. He is then said to be ignorant of the day of Judgment, not because he doth not know it, but because he thinks it not fit to manifest it to his Disciples. For he tells them, *John 16. 12. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Amongst which things*

things is understood the day of Judgment. For since the holy Scripture is true, and cannot contradict itself; and since we read in one place that he knows all things, and in another that he knows not the day of Judgment, we must explain the Scripture, and understand the former of his Divinity, and the latter of his Humanity; or in that sense as I have explain'd it.

5. Objection. If Jesus Christ was really and properly true God, his Resurrection should be ascribed unto him, as the true and Principal Author.

But it is not ascribed unto him, as the true and Principal Author; but to his Father; as we read in several places of the holy Scripture, *Gal. 1. 1. God the Father, who raised him from the dead, Act. 3. 26. God having raised up his Son Jesus.*

30 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

*Ergo* he is not really and properly true God.

Answer. *As à non esse ad posse* the Consequence is not good; so because the Son did not raise up himself from the dead, it doth not follow that he could not. For the contrary appears by his own words, *John 10. 17. I lay down my life that I might take it again; no man takes it from me, but I lay it down my self. I have Power to lay it down, and I have Power to take it again.*

6. Objection. Jesus Christ is Mediator between God and Men; for, *Tim. 2. 5. There is one God and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.* But if he was truly and properly God; God should be Mediator between Men and himself, which is absurd, because no body is Mediator between himself and another.

Answer. Jesus Christ is Mediator

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 31*  
diator between God and Men, not  
as he is God *reduplicative ut sic*;  
but as he is Jesus Christ, that is,  
as he is hypostatically united with  
the Humane Nature; and there-  
fore he is not Mediator between  
God and himself; but between  
God and Men.

7. Objection. When Jesus  
Christ was going to die, he speaks  
these words, *Mat. 26. 46. My*  
*God, my God, why hast thou forsaken*  
*me?* And in another Place he  
saith, *I am going to my God and to*  
*your God, to my Father, and to your*  
*Father.* These words do plainly  
shew that he is not truly and pro-  
perly God; for, since there is but  
one God, and can be no more;  
how could Jesus Christ, if he had  
been the true God have said, *my*  
*God, my God! why hast thou for-*  
*saken me?* and how could he have  
said, *I am going to my God, and to*  
*your God?* This could not be rea-  
sonably

32 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

sonably said, unless we own the plurality of Gods.

Answer. When Jesus Christ spake these words, his Divinity was hypostatically united with our Humane Nature; and therefore as he was God; so was he a Man. And as Man, he might very well say, *my God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me? I am going to my God, and to your God; to my Father, and to your Father.* And therefore it doth not follow, that though Jesus Christ be God, and speak these words, we can infer the plurality of Gods.

8. Objection. Jesus Christ, saith St. Paul 1 Cor. 15. 25. *Must reign, till his Father has put all Enemies under his feet.* And ver. 28. he saith, *that when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subdued unto him that put all things under him, that*  
God

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 33*  
*God may be all in all. From which*  
words I infer this Argument.

He that is truly and properly  
God, cannot be subject to ano-  
ther.

But the Son himself shall be  
subject unto his Father, that put  
all things under him.

*Ergo* he is not truly and proper-  
ly God.

Answer. He that is truly and  
properly God, cannot be subject  
to another, *Distinguo*. He can-  
not be subject to another accord-  
ing to his Divine Nature, *Concedo*.  
according to his Humane Nature,  
*Nego*. But the Son himself shall  
be subject to his Father, as he is  
Man, *Concedo* but as he is God,  
*Nego*.

9. Objection. Jesus Christ is  
called, *Col. 1. 15. The first-born*  
*of every Creature*. He is not the  
first born according to his huma-  
nity; for many Men were born  
before

### 34 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

before him ; therefore it must needs be according to his other Nature. Now, if he be the first born according to his other Nature, it follows that he cannot be properly true God ; for God can neither be a Creature, nor born : for to be either supposes a beginning, which cannot be found in God ; for he is Eternal, and consequently without beginning.

Answer. By the first born of every Creature, is meant the first begotten, as ye may see in the Latin Translation, and Greek Original. For in the Latin Translation it is said *Primogenitus*, and in the Greek Original we read. *πρωτόγενετος*. As ye may see also in our English Translation *Heb. i. 6*. Wherein *St. Paul*, calls him the first begotten *πρωτόγενετος*, And that this is the meaning of *St. Paul*, *Col. i. 15*. The words immediately following do clearly shew it ;

For



*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost 35*

For by him saith he, were all things Created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominations, or Principalities, or Powers, all things where created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. Now since by him were all things Created; and since he is before all things, it necessarily follows that he is the first begotten, not as he is the Son of Man, but as he is the Son of God. And as he is the Son of God, he is truly and properly God.

10. Objection. The Son is begotten even as he his the Son of God.

But that, which is begotten, was not always; that which was not always, is not eternal; that which is not eternal, is not really and properly true God.

Ergo the Son even as he is the  
Son

36 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

Son of God is not really and properly true God.

Answer. That which is begotten *in tempore*, was not always, I grant it. That which is begotten *ab æterno* was not always, I deny that. But the Son of God is begotten *ab æterno*, because he is begotten necessarily, and therefore he was always.

Wherefore I say, that though by the aforementioned Texts of the holy Scriptures, and Arguments deduced from them, it seems to the *Arians* and *Socinians* that the Father only is really and properly true God ; yet since the holy Scripture is true, because revealed by God, and we find therein that the Son of God is called God, the true God, the Eternal Life, God blessed for ever, the Almighty, and equal to his Father : and since all the essential attributes of the God-head are ascribed

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 37*  
ascribed unto him, we do infer  
that he is really and properly true  
God.

II. Objection. The Son of  
God, say the *Arians* and *Socini-  
ans*, may be called God, Almight-  
ty, the Eternal Life, the Crea-  
tor, and have all the other At-  
tributes of the God-head; and  
yet not be really and properly true  
God; because all these Divine At-  
tributes are ascribed unto him de-  
pendently, and as a second and  
Instrumental cause; as it appears  
by several Texts of the holy Scri-  
ptures. As for example, *God who  
at sundry times spake in time past  
unto the Fathers by the Prophets,  
hath in these last days spoken unto  
us by his Son, by whom he made the  
worlds, Heb. 1. 2. And in the  
Act. 3. 22. We read that he was  
a Man approved by God by miracles,  
wonders and signs, which God did  
by him, And Ephes. 3. 9. We read,*  
E that

38 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*  
that God Created all things by Jesus  
Christ.

But the Divine Attributes are  
in God independently, and as in  
the first cause.

*Ergo*, since they are found in  
the Son dependently, and as in an  
Instrumental cause, it follows that  
he is not really and properly true  
God.

Answer. There are in God  
two sorts of Action, one *ad intra*,  
and the other *ad extra*. The for-  
mer is necessary, and the latter  
voluntary. That, which is *ad*  
*intra*, as the Generation of the  
Son, is necessary, and cannot be  
otherwise; for the Father could  
not be without begetting his Son  
from all eternity. And that, which  
is *ad extra*, as the Creation of the  
World, is voluntary, and might  
be and not be. The Actions *ad*  
*intra* are not common to the Di-  
vine Persons; for the Son doth  
not

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 39*

not beget the Father, but the Father begets his Son; and the Father and the Son do both produce the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost doth not produce the Father and the Son. But the Actions *ad extra* are common to the three Divine Persons; They equally concur in the Creation of the World. And therefore it is false to say, that the Divine Attributes are found in the Son dependently, and consequently that he is not really and properly true God.

But for the better understanding of Christ's Divinity, we must know, that Jesus Christ the Son of God had a real Being before he was born of the blessed Virgin *Mary*; as it appears by his own words, when speaking to his Disciples, he saith, *John 6. 62. what if you shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before.* And

#### 40 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

*John 16. 28. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the World, again I leave the World, and go to the Father. And as it will be more plainly seen by this ensuing argument.*

Whosoever was before *John the Baptist*, and before *Abraham*, and before the World was made, was certainly before Christ was born of the blessed Virgin *Mary*.

But the Son of God was really existent before *John the Baptist*, before *Abraham*, and before the World was made.

*Ergo* he had a real Being before he was born of the blessed Virgin *Mary*.

The Major proposition is without any dispute; and the Minor is prov'd by the holy Scripture, *John 1. 15. This is he of whom I spake, he that comes after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me, John 8. 58. Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was,*

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 41*

*I am. And St. Paul Heb. 1. 2. saith that by him the worlds were made. This being known and true I argue thus.*

This Being, which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, was not Created, but was the Divine Essence, by which he was always truly and properly God. For he, who was subsisting in the form of God, and was equal with God, must of necessity be truly and essentially God; because there can be no equality between the Divine Essence, which is Infinite, and any other whatsoever, which is finite. But so was Christ, as we may see by these words of *St. Paul Phil. 2. 6. Being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of man.*

42 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

Out of which words, three propositions do fully result demonstrating my Assertion. 1. That Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a Servant. 2. That he was in the form of a Servant, as soon as he was made Man. 3. That he was in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the Divine Nature, as he was in the form of a Servant or in the Nature of a Man. For he was so in the form of God as thereby to be equal with God. There can be but one Infinite, Eternal and Independent Being; and there can be no comparison between that Infinite, Eternal and Independent Being, and that which is finite, temporal and dependent. He therefore, who did truly think himself equal with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one Infinite, Eternal and Independent



dent Nature of God. And therefore as here Christ was really and essentially Man, of the same Nature with us (sin only excepted) in whose similitude he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same Nature and Substance with him, in whose form he did subsist.

This Truth is confirmed by these words of the 1 Epistle of St. John 5. 20. *we know that the Son of man is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his own Son Jesus Christ, this is the true God and Eternal Life.* And by these of St. Paul, Rom. 9. 5. *And of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.* Whence we may infer, that he, who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him before he was in the Nature of Man;

44 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

Man; and who is called God, true God, Eternal Life, the Almighty, and in every way whereby the supream Deity is expressed, has an eternal and indivisible Essence and Nature with God.

But Christ was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him, before he was in the Nature of Man; and he is called God, true God, Eternal Life, the Almighty, and in every way whereby the Supream Deity is expressed.

*Ergo*, he has an eternal and indivisible Essence and Nature with God; ergo he is really and properly true God.

Every Christian grants that the Father is the true God; every one grants that God only is to be worshiped and serv'd, according to these words of *Deu. 6. 13. Mat. 4. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve.*

Therefore

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 45*

Therefore we must grant that the Son also is the true God, seeing we are commanded to worship him, and to give him the same honour as we give to the Father. Which is seen by these words of St. Paul Heb. 1. 6. *Let all the Angels of God worship him; and by those of St. John 5. 22. 23. who has committed all Judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* If then we are obliged to worship the God of *Israel* only; if we be also commanded to give the same honour to the Son, which we give to the Father; it is necessary we should believe that the Son is the God of *Israel*, and consequently, truly, and properly God.

Which is clearly seen by these words of St. John 1. 3. *all things were made by him, and without him*  
was

46 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*  
*was not any thing made that was*  
*made.*

*For he doth not say all things but  
by meaning the things which are  
made, to wit all Creatures. whence  
it clearly appears that he, by whom  
all things were made, was not made.  
And if he was not made, he is not  
a Creature; if he be not a Creature,  
he is of the same substance with his  
Father; for every substance, which  
is not God, is a Creature, and that,  
which is not a Creature, is God.  
And if the Son be not of the same  
substance with his Father, then he  
is a Substance made; if a Substance  
made, all things were not made by  
him: but all things were made by  
him, therefore he is of the same  
Substance with his Father, and con-  
sequently he is not only God, but  
true God.*

*Which is confirmed by these  
words of St. Paul, Col. I. 17.  
Wherein he is said to exist before  
all.*

all things. For if he was not true God, he should be a Creature. If a Creature, we could not say that he is before all things, because he, who should have Created him, should have had his existence before : for every Creature supposes an antecedent Being, from which it has receiv'd its Existence. Seeing therefore he is said to exist before all things, it is because he is the true God ; for none but the true God can be truly and properly said to exist before all things.

12. Objection. If Jesus Christ be God and Man, in him are two Persons.

But in him is but one Person.

*Ergo*, he is not God and Man.

The second Proposition is allowed by all Trinitarians.

And the first is prov'd thus.

Wheresoever are two Natures, each of which has all the essentials  
of

48 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*  
of a Person, here are two Persons.

But in Jesus Christ are two Natures, each of which has all the essentials of a Person.

*Ergo*, in Jesus Christ are two Persons.

Answer. Wheresoever are two Natures, each of which has all the essentials of a Person, here are two Persons, *distinguo Majorem*. If these two Natures be separated one from another, *Concedo*. If they be hypostatically united together, *Nego*. But in Jesus Christ are two Natures separated one from another *Nego minorem*; hypostatically united together, *Concedo*. *Ergo* in Jesus Christ are two Persons, *Nego Consequentiam*.

And suppose there were two Persons in Jesus Christ, this Argument is of no force in this place, for it neither destroys the Divinity

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 49*  
ty of Jesus Christ, nor the Trinity  
of the Divine Persons.

13. **Objection.** If Jesus Christ  
had been willing we should believe  
a Trinity of Persons in the God-  
head, why did he not teach his  
Apostles such a Doctrine, when  
he was here upon Earth? and if  
he has taught it, why is it not  
plainly declared in their Wri-  
tings? Could they not say and  
write? Hitherto ye have believ'd  
in one God the Father of all things,  
but now if ye intend to be sav'd,  
ye must believe that there is a Tri-  
nity in one God, that the Father,  
the Son, and the Holy Ghost,  
though they be three really Di-  
stinct Persons, yet they have but  
one Nature, and these Three make  
but one God? Could they not  
speak and write so? and since  
they did not, it is an evident sign,  
that either they did not believe  
such a Doctrine, or that we have  
F now

50 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

now more wit and understanding than had then Jesu Christ and his Apostles ; seeing we can now explain those things, which Jesus Christ and his Apostles could not at that time.

And if Jesus Christ had been the true God, why did he not openly Preach and Declare it ? And why did not his Apostles declare it better in their Writings than they have done ? We read they often call him the Son of God, and the Man Christ Jesus, and his Father the only true God ; Therefore we may infer they did not believe him to be the true God.

Answer 1. I say concerning the *Trinity*, that it is plainly declar'd by these Words of the 1 Epistle of St. John 5. 7. *There are three, that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* As also by these words of Jesus Christ  
in



*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 51*

in St. *Matthew* 28. 19. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For, since we read that the Father is God, that the Son is God, that the Holy Ghost is God; and that there is but one God; it plainly follows that there is a *Trinity*; for by this Word, *Trinity*, we mean three Eternal and Infinite Persons Subsisting in one and the same Nature or God-head.

2. I say concerning the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he has sufficiently declar'd it, when he said, *I and my Father are one*, *John* 10. 30. And that his Apostles have plainly spoken of it in several Places of their Writings, as ye may see in this Treatise Pag.

3. 4. 5. 6. &c.

For, either the holy Scripture is true or not. If it be not true, I have nothing to say against the

52 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

*Arians and Socinians.* But if it be true, as they grant it to be, I make these three Arguments, which shall be able to convince them.

1. He that exists before all things, and by whom were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth visible and invisible, is *strictè loquendo* the true God.

But Christ, considered as the Son of God, exists before all things, and by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth visible and invisible, as ye may see *Col. 1. 17.* and *1. 15.*

*Ergo* Christ, considered as the Son of God, is *strictè loquendo* the true God.

2. He, that is not a Creature, is *strictè loquendo* or properly speaking the true God.

But

But Christ, considered as the Son of God, is not a Creature.

*Ergo* Christ, considered as the Son of God, is *strictè loquendo* or properly speaking the true God.

The Major proposition is true; as for the Minor, which is in question, I prove it thus.

He, that was not made, is not a Creature.

But Christ, considered as the Son of God, was not made.

*Ergo* Christ, considered as the Son of God, is not a Creature. The Major proposition is also true; as for the Minor, I prove it thus.

He, by whom all things were made, the same was not made.

But by Christ, considered as the Son of God, all things were made, as ye may see *John* 1. 3.

*Ergo* Christ, considered as the Son of God, was not made. The Major proposition is true; for if he had been made, all things should

54 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

should have not been made by him, since he should be supposed made; But all things were made by him; *Ergo* he was not made; *Ergo* he is not a Creature; *Ergo* he is *strictè loquendo* or properly speaking the true God.

3. He, to whom all Religious honour is to be given, is *strictè loquendo* or properly speaking the true God.

But to Christ, considered as the Son of God, all Religious honour is to be given.

*Ergo* Christ, considered as the Son of God, is *strictè loquendo* or properly speaking the true God.

The Major Proposition is true; as for the Minor, I prove it thus.

*John 5. 23. All men ought to honour the Son even as they honour the Father.*

But all Men are obliged to give all Religious Honour to the Father; *Ergo* they are obliged to give

*Of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost. 55*

give all religious honour to the Son; becaule the same honour is to be given to the Son as to the Father.

*Ergo* Christ, considered as the Son of God, is *strictè loquendo*, or properly speaking the true God as well as his Father.

The *Trinity* and Divinity of Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost may be prov'd again in this manner. In the First Chapter of *Genesis* it is written, *God said, let there be light, let there be a firmament, let there be &c. and it was so.* Therefore it is evident that God by his word created the World. So saith *St. Paul Heb. 11. 3. The worlds were framed by the word of God. Now the word was God, and the word was made Flesh;* as ye may see, *John 1. 1. 14.* And, since the word, which was made flesh, is that we call Jesus Christ, or the Son of God; it follows  
that

56 *Of the Trinity and Divinity.*  
that Christ or the Son of God is  
God and Man. Now in these  
words, (*God said or God spake*) we  
see the Father and the Son. For,  
as he is speaking, here is the Fa-  
ther; and as the word is spoken,  
there is the Son. Now the Fa-  
ther and the Son *Spirant*. And  
that Spirit, which is holy, and  
proceeds from the Father and the  
Son, is that we call the Holy  
Ghost; *which moved upon the face  
of the waters; which came upon the  
blessed Virgin; gave utterance to  
the Apostles, and guided them unto  
all truth.* Now the Father, the  
Son, and the Holy Ghost, tho'  
they be really distinct one from a-  
nother; because the Father is not  
the Son, nor the Son the Father,  
nor the Holy Ghost the Father  
and the Son; yet, as I have made  
it appear, they have but one and  
the same Substance, and conse-  
quently

*of J. Christ and of the H. Ghost.* 57  
quently they are but one and the  
same God.

I do not here mention the Fa-  
thers and Councils, who have as-  
serted the *Trinity* and Divinity of  
our Lord Jesus Christ; because  
they are rejected by our Adversa-  
ries. Neither do I quote a great  
number of Saints and Martyrs,  
who dyed in, and gave their  
Blood for that Faith; because my  
undertaking was to prove these  
Articles of our Christian Do-  
ctrine by the authority of the holy  
Scriptures; which Articles I think  
I have sufficiently clear'd and  
hope will be granted by any im-  
partial Reader.

Let then the *Arians* and *Socini-  
ans* remember, that the Christian  
Religion is grounded upon Faith;  
and therefore that they greatly mi-  
stake, when they pretend by the  
strength of their reason to compre-  
hend all the Articles thereof. For,  
as

58 *Of the Trinity and Divinity*

as I have already said; there is this difference between Natural and Christian Religion: in the Natural Religion Men believe nothing but what is apprehended by their reason; but in the Christian we ~~are to~~ believe many things, which we cannot conceive by the strength of our reason. Such are the *Trinity* and *Divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ. Christians are to submit their reason to these Articles of Faith, though they cannot comprehend them. In these reasons has nothing to do; we are to be determined by Faith, without which no Christian shall ever be sav'd. For *Mark. 16. 16.* it is thus Written; *He that believeth not, shall be damned.*



---

O F

# God's Existence.

---

---

---

## Of God's Existence.

### C H A P. I.

**T***hat there is a God, is a truth far better engraven in all the Parts of this World, than the name of the Artificer was in the Image of his Minerva: for even the dumb Creatures do so loudly proclaim Him, that I may say with Job; 12. 7, 8. Ask now the Beasts of the Earth, and they shall teach Thee: and the Fowls of the Air, and they shall tell Thee; and the Fishes of the Sea, and they shall declare Him unto Thee. And as all Creatures are so many Letters, from which we may spell the Existence of a God, so the wonderful Order, wherein he governs and keeps this great World, doth evidently*

---

---

*De l'Existence d'un Dieu.*

C H A P. I.

**Q**U'il y ait un Dieu, c'est une vérité beaucoup mieux gravée dans toutes les parties de ce Monde, que n'étoit le nom de l'ouvrier dans l'image de la *Minerve* : Car les créatures mêmes, qui sont muettes, le publient si hautement, que je puis dire avec Job, 12. 7. 8. *Demande le aux bêtes de la terre, & ils te l'enseigneront ; aux oiseaux du Ciel, & ils te le diront ; & aux poissons de la mer, & ils te le déclareront.* Et comme toutes les créatures sont autant de lettres, par lesquelles nous pouvons épeller l'Existence d'un Dieu ; ainsi l'ordre admirable,

B 2

ble,

#### 4      Of God's Existence.

*dently shew us his Infinite wisdom.*

By God we understand a Perfect Being, existing of it self, Eternal, only one, Infinite, Immutable, entirely Simple, and a Spirit. Now that there is such a Being, is that, which I shall endeavour to shew evidently.

Whatsoever is thinking, the same has a Being; for that, which is not, doth not think. And that there is a Being, that is thinking, the very Denyer of it may be convinced from his own Denial. For his Denial must proceed from this, that he thinketh, there is no such thing as thinking. Therefore either he thinks true, or he thinks false. If He grant he thinks false, he owns that there is a thinking Being; and if he grant that he thinks true, he must also confess, that he is thinking: and so either way he will be necessitated to acknowledge.

ble, dans lequel il gouverne & conserve ce grand Monde, nous fait voir clairement sa Sagesse infinie.

Par un Dieu, nous entendons un Etre parfait, existant de soy-même, éternel, seul, infini, immuable, entierement simple, & spirituel; or qu'il y ait un tel Etre, c'est ce que je tacheray de faire voir clairement.

Tout ce qui pense, a un Etre; car ce qui n'est pas, ne pense point. Or qu'il y ait un Etre qui pense, celui-là même qui le deniera, en sera pleinement convaincu par son propre Désaveu. Car son Désaveu doit précéder de ce qu'il pense, qu'il n'y a pas un Etre qui pense; ou donc il pense vrai, ou il pense faux; sil accorde qu'il pense faux, il avoue donc qu'il y a un Etre qui pense; & s'il avoue qu'il pense vrai, il faut aussi qu'il confesse pu'il pense: & ainsi d'une maniere ou d'une autre, il est obli-

## 6 Of God's Existence.

knowledge, that there is some thing that thinks, and has an actual Being, which is the subject of his thought.

And whatsoever has an actual Being, or doth exist, the same must have its existence, either of it self, or from another : and whatsoever receives its Existence from another, the same is not perfect Being, because it depends upon another for its Existence, provided there be any other Being, which doth not receive its Existence from another.

And that there is a Being, which doth not receive its Existence from another, is clear from hence, that the reason of a thing existing by the vertue of another, is because there is some other thing, which causes it to exist. We must then either admit a progress in Infinite of Beings, or that there is a Being, which has nothing of Existence from another. And that the Progress in  
Infinite

gé d'avouer qu'il y a un Etre qui pense, & qui a un Etre actuel, qui est le sujet de sa pensée.

Et tout ce qui a un Etre actuel, ou existe, doit avoir son Existence, ou de soy-même, ou par un autre : Et tout ce qui reçoit son Existence par un autre, n'est pas un Etre parfait, parce qu'il dépend d'un autre quant à son Existence, pourvû qu'il y ait un autre Etre, qui ne reçoive pas son Existence d'un autre.

Or qu'il y ait un Etre, qui ne reçoive pas son Existence d'un autre, je le montre clairement, parce que la raison qui fait qu'une chose existe par la vertu d'un autre, est parce qu'il y a quelqu'autre chose, qui la fait exister : Il faut donc admettre, ou le progres à l'infini, ou qu'il y ait un Etre, qui n'a point son Existence d'un autre. Or que le progres à l'infini d'un nombre innombrable de  
cho.

*Infinite of an innumerable number of things, causing others to exist, is impossible to have been is clear; because a by-past series of things may be encreased by a new addition made unto; and a series of things, which may be encreased, is not infinite, for otherwise there might be some thing, that could be greater than Infinite, which questionless cannot be. Therefore there must of necessity be some first Cause, which doth not receive its Existence from another, but exists wholly of itself, and is consequently the first Cause. For in all sensible things we find an order of efficient Causes; and we do not find, that any of 'em be the efficient Cause of it self; because it should have been before it was, which cannot be. And the progress in Infinite in Causes efficient one another is impossible; because in these efficient*



choses, qui font exister les autres, soit impossible, c'est ce qui est évident; parce que la succession des choses passées peut être accrûe par quelque chose de nouveau; & la succession des choses qui peuvent être augmentées, n'est pas infinie, car autrement il y auroit quelque chose, qui pourroit être plus grand que l'infini, ce qui sans doute ne peut être. C'est pourquoy il faut de nécessité qu'il y ait un premier Etre, qui ne reçoive point son Etre d'un autre, mais qui existe entierement de soy-même, & par consequent qui soit la premiere cause. Car dans les choses sensibles, nous trouvons un ordre de causes efficientes; & nous ne trouvons pas qu'aucune d'icelles soit cause efficiente de soy-même, parce qu'elle auroit été avant qu'elle fût, ce qui ne peut pas être. Or il n'est pas possible de proceder à l'infini dans les causes efficientes

*cient Causes one is the cause of another, and this of another, and so successively. And consequently it that causes the other is first; and it that is caused or effect is second, or last, in case there be no other following. Now the Cause being taken away, the effect ceases. If then there be no first cause in efficient Causes, there shall neither be a second nor last. Which is false; since we see the contrary every day, as it appears in the Generations of Men, wherein one is the Cause of another, and so successively. And therefore we must of necessity admit a first Cause of all things.*

*And that, which is the first Cause, must of necessity have always existed, or been from Eternity: This is most certain, because if  
there*

efficientes les unes des autres, parce que dans ces causes efficientes, l'une est cause de l'autre, & cellecy de l'autre, & ainsi successivement. Et par consequent celle qui cause l'autre, est premiere, & celle qui est cause ou effet, est seconde ou derniere, supposé qu'il n'y en ait point d'autre qui suive. Or la cause étant ôtée, l'effet cesse. Si donc il n'y a point de premiere cause dans les causes efficientes, il n'y en aura point de seconde ni de derniere ; ce qui est faux, puisque nous voyons tous les jours le contraire, ainsi qu'il paroît dans la génération des hommes, dont l'un est cause de l'autre, & ainsi successivement. Il faut donc de nécessité admettre une premiere cause de toutes choses.

Et ce qui est la premiere cause, doit par nécessité avoir toujours été, ou existé de toute éternité ; c'est ce qui est très-certain, parce  
que

there had been a time when it was not, it must of nothing have become something, seeing it self was first. And in case it should of nothing have become something, it would have been before it had its Existence, and consequently have been and not have been at once; which is a Contradiction, and consequently impossible. For Being supposed to be the first Being, if ever it had a beginning, it must have been both the Producer, and the thing produced at the same time; and consequently as it was the Producer, must be supposed to have had a Being; and as it was the thing produced, to have had no Being, and both at the same instant, which is a manifest Contradiction.

It is then true, that the first Being is necessarily Eternal à parte ante; and what is necessarily Eternal

que s'il y avoit eu un temps qu'il n'eût pas été, de rien il seroit devenu quelque chose, puis qu'il étoit le premier. Et supposé que de rien il fût devenu quelque chose, il auroit été avant qu'il eût eu son Existence, & par conséquent auroit été & non été en même temps; ce qui est une contradiction, & conséquemment impossible. Car, supposé qu'il soit le premier Etre, si jamais il a eu de commencement, il doit en même temps avoir été le Producteur, & tout ensemble la chose produite; & par conséquent, comme il étoit le Producteur, il faut supposer qu'il a eu un Etre; & comme il étoit la chose produite, qu'il n'a point eu d'Existence, & l'un & l'autre dans un même instant; ce qui est une manifeste contradiction.

Il est donc vray que le premier Etre est nécessairement Eternel à *parte ante*; Or ce qui est nécessaire-

C

ment

*nal à parte ante, is likewise so à parte post; because having nothing of Existence from another, it must necessarily exist of it self: and what necessarily exists of it self, cannot but exist. And what cannot but exist, ought Eternally to exist; and consequently the first Being, as it never had a beginning, so shall it never have an end.*

*Since then Existence is essential to the first Being; and since the first Being has no dependance on another, but exists intirely of it self, there are of necessity no more first Beings but one. For in case we should suppose there were more first Beings Eternally co-existing, we must grant that Existence is equally essential to them all, and consequently that there is no essential difference among them, and therefore that there are several Eternal and infinite*

ment Eternel à *parte ante*, l'est semblablement à *parte post* ; parce que n'ayant point son Existence d'un autre, il faut par nécessité qu'il existe de soy-même ; & ce qui par nécessité existe de soy-même, ne peut pas qu'il n'existe. Et ce qui ne peut pas qu'il n'existe, doit éternellement exister ; & conséquemment le premier Etre, comme'il n'a jamais eu de commencement, aussi n'aura-t'il jamais de fin.

Puis donc que l'Existence est nécessaire au premier Etre ; & puis que le premier Etre ne dépend point d'un autre, mais existe entièrement de soy-même, il faut par nécessité qu'il n'y ait qu'un premier Etre : Car si nous supposons qu'il y ait plusieurs premiers Etres éternellement co-existants, nous devons accorder que l'Existence leur est également essentielle à tous, & conséquemment qu'il n'y a point entr'eux de diffé-

## 16 Of God's Existence.

*finite Beings, which imploy a manifest contradiction; for the plurality of Gods is contrary to Reason.*

*It is then evident, that there is one only first Being; and it is no less evident, that the same is infinite in Essence and Perfection. For in case it were of a finite nature, it must have by some means or other been limited, for what has no limitation, is Infinite. And if the first Being be limited, it must of necessity be limited by it self, by reason it alone Being before all other Beings, it could not possibly be any thing besides it self to limit him. And that he should limit himself, we have no reason to think so.*

*The first Being then is Infinite in Essence and Perfection; and what is necessarily so, cannot possibly ei-  
either*



rence essentielle, & partant qu'il y a plusieurs Etres éternels & infinis, ce qui est une manifeste contradiction; car la pluralité des Dieux est contraire à la raison.

Il est donc évident qu'il y a un seul premier Etre; & il n'est pas moins évident qu'il soit infini en Essence & Perfection. Car, en cas qu'il fut d'une nature finie, il faut qu'il ait été limité d'une façon ou d'une autre; car ce qui n'est pas limité, est infini. Or si le premier Etre est limité, il faut de nécessité qu'il soit limité par luy-même; d'autant qu'étant seul devant tous les autres Etres, il n'étoit possible qu'il y eut quelque autre Etre que luy-même pour le limiter; & qu'il se limitât luy-même, nous n'avons aucune raison de le penser ainsi.

Donc le premier Etre est infini en essence & perfection; & ce qui est nécessairement tel, ne peut

## 18 Of God's Existence.

ther acquire or lose any thing, whereby its Perfection can in any respect whatsoever be either augmented or diminished: and what cannot in any respect whatsoever receive either augmentation, or diminution, is wholly Immutable; the first Being therefore is Immutable.

And whatsoever is Immtuable, has nothing of Potentiality or Passibility belonging to it; for otherwise it would not be impossible, that it should be changed from Power to Act. And what has nothing at all of Potentiality or Passibility belonging to it, must of necessity be a pure essential Act. And that, which is a pure essential Act, is void of all manner of composition; and what is void of all manner of composition, is absolutely simple. The first Being therefore is absolutely and altogether simple.

And

pas acquérir ou perdre aucune chose, par laquelle sa perfection puisse être en aucune façon, ou augmentée, ou diminuée: & ce qui ne peut en aucune façon recevoir augmentation, ou diminution, est entièrement immuable; donc il s'ensuit que le premier Etre est immuable.

Or ce qui est immuable, n'a en soy aucune Potentialité ou Passibilité; car autrement il ne seroit pas impossible, qu'il changeat de la Puissance à l'Acte. Et ce qui n'a en soy aucune Potentialité ou Passibilité, doit être par nécessité un pur Acte essentiel. Et ce qui est un pur Acte essentiel, doit être exempt de toute sorte de Composition; & ce qui est exempt de toute sorte de Composition, est entièrement simple; c'est pourquoy le premier Etre est absolument & entièrement simple.

*Et*

*And that, which is absolutely simple, has no parts at all, and by consequence whatever is contained in it, the same is its whole entire it self and Being. And what has no parts, cannot be corporeal, because a Body consists of parts really exclusive of one another. And what is not corporeal, is immaterial; and what is immaterial is spiritual; wherefore the first Being is a Spirit.*

*It is then true, that there is a perfect Being, Existing of it self, Eternal, only one, Infinite, Immutabile, intirely simple, and a Spirit, which we usually call by the name of God. Again we see that the natural Bodies, which are without knowledge, do all work for an end, because they do always or almost always work in the same manner; and consequently for a very good end. Whence it is evident, that they*

Et ce qui est entierement simple, n'a point de parties, & par consequent tout ce qui est en luy, est entierement luy-même & son Etre. Or tout ce qui n'a point de parties, ne peut être corporel ; parce qu'un corps est composé de parties, qui sont réellement exclusives les unes des autres. Et ce qui n'est pas corporel, est sans matiere ; & ce qui est sans matiere, est spirituel ; donc le premier Etre est spirituel.

Il est donc vray, qu'il y a un Etre Parfait, existant de luy-même, éternel, seul, infini, immuable, entierement simple, & spirituel, auquel nous donnons communement le nom de Dieu. De plus, nous voyons que les choses naturelles qui sont sans connoissance, operent toutes pour une fin, parce qu'elles operent toujours, ou presque toujours de la même maniere ; & par consequent pour  
une.

*they do not work by chance, but by intention. Now the Bodies, which are without knowledge, do not tend to their end, unless they be directed by some intelligent Being, as it appears in an Arrow that is shot, which doth not arrive to its end, but by the intention of him, that shot it. There is then an intelligent Being, by whom all natural Bodies, that are without knowledge, are directed to their End. And to this intelligent Being we give the name of God. Thom. Aquinas, q. 2. Art. 3.*

*Whereas I made it appear, that there is one only first Being, whose Existence alone has no Dependance on another; it must needs be that the Universe is either God himself, or that it was originally derived from him. And that the Universe is not God, is plain from this, that*  
God

une fin qui est très-bonne. D'où il est évident qu'elles n'operent point par hazard, mais par intention. Or les choses, qui sont sans connoissance, ne tendent point à leur fin, à moins qu'elles n'y soient dirigées par quelqu'un qui est intelligent; ainsi qu'il paroît en une flèche décochée, qui n'arrive point à sa fin, que par l'intention de celui qui la décoche. Donc il y a un *Etre* intelligent, par qui toutes les choses naturelles, qui sont sans connoissance, sont dirigées à leur fin. Et à cet *Etre* intelligent, nous donnons le nom de Dieu. *Thom. d'Aquin. q. 2. Art. 3.*

D'autant que j'ay montré clairement, qu'il y a un seul premier *Etre*, dont l'Existence seule ne depend point d'un autre; il s'ensuit évidemment, ou que l'Univers est Dieu luy-même, ou qu'il est dérivé de luy. Or il est manifeste, que l'Univers n'est pas  
Dieu

24      Of God's Existence.

*God is one simple Being, whereas the Universe is some way or other compounded. For Body is compounded of several material Atoms; Man of Body and Soul; Angels of Essence and Existence, and all these things of Substance and Accidents. Wherefore the Universe or the World with all that therein is, was originally derived from God alone.*

*And since the World is originally derived from God alone, every thing, which it contains, must of necessity be either of the same nature which God is of, or else it must be created of nothing (there being only one first Being.) And it is evident, that the things, which are in this World, do not participate of the same nature with God, because there is nothing in God, which is not God; otherwise all things, that are contained in the World, would be God: which cannot be, for the Plurality of  
Gods*



Dieu , parce que Dieu est un simple Etre , & que l'Univers est composé de parties. Car le corps est composé de differents Atomes materiels ; l'Homme de corps & d'ame , & les Anges d'Essence & d'Existence , & toutes ces choses de substance & d'accidents. C'est pourquoy l'Univers ou le Monde , & tout ce qui est en luy , est originaiement derivé de Dieu seul.

Or puis que le monde est originaiement derivé de Dieu seul , il faut que tout ce qui s'y rencontre , soit par necessité , ou de la nature dont Dieu est , ou qu'il soit créé de rien , parce qu'il n'y a qu'un seul premier Etre. Or il est évident que les choses qui se rencontrent au monde , ne sont point de la nature de Dieu , dautant qu'il n'y a rien en Dieu , qui ne soit Dieu ; autrement toutes les choses , qui sont contenûes dans le monde , seroient Dieu : ce qui

D

ne

26 Of God's Existence.

*Gods is impossible, because many Eternal and Infinite cannot subsist together. All things therefore without contradiction were at first created or produced by God of nothing.*

*And whatsoever is created, the same could not be Eternal, but must have had a Beginning; otherwise there would have been an infinite Duration, an infinite number of Days, of Months, of Years already past: and consequently, seeing one Infinite is not greater than another, (for it is not Infinite, to which any thing can be added) there would have been no more days than months, nor more months than years since the Creation of the world. And on the contrary, seeing there are more days than months, and more months than years in the same long continuance of time;*

ne peut pas être , car la pluralité des Dieux est impossible, d'autant que plusieurs Eternels & Infinis ne sçauroient subsister ensemble. Il est donc sans contradiction , que toutes les choses qui sont au monde, ont été créés ou produites par Dieu, de rien.

Or tout ce qui est créé, ne peut pas être éternel, mais doit avoir un commencement, autrement il y auroit eu une durée infinie, un nombre infini de jours, de mois & d'années déjà passées ; & conséquemment , puis qu'une infinité n'est pas plus grande qu'une autre ( car cela n'est pas infini , à quoy quelque chose peut être ajoutée ) il n'y auroit pas eu plus de jours que de mois , ni plus de mois que d'années depuis la Création du monde. Et au contraire, puis que dans une même continuation de temps il y a plus de jours que de mois, & plus de mois

time; there would have been more days than months, and more months than years since the Creation, which is a Contradiction.

Again, supposing the world to have had an infinite duration, and Mankind the like continuance: there was either an infinite Series of Generations of Men a thousand years ago past, or there was not. If there was not, a thousand Generations elapsed since, could not make the foregoing number infinite; for of two finite added together an infinite cannot arise. And if the Series of Generations of Men was a thousand years ago Infinite, then a thousand Generations have been added since to that which was before infinite: And so, since nothing is infinite, to which any addition can be made, the Series of Generations of Men from the Creation of the world should be both  
infinite

que d'années ; il y auroit eu plus de jours que de mois , & plus de mois que d'années depuis la Création, ce qui est une contradiction.

Supposons encore que le monde a eu une durée infinie, & que le genre humain a eu une semblable continuation ; ou bien il y a eu une succession infinie de générations d'hommes , depuis mille ans passez , ou il n'y en a point eu. S'il n'y en a point eu , mille générations , qui sont arrivées depuis , ne sçauroient pas faire un nombre infini ; car de deux finis ajoutez ensemble , un infini ne peut pas en resulter. Et si la succession de générations d'hommes étoit infinie il y a mille ans , alors mille générations ont été ajoutées à ce qui étoit auparavant infini ; & partant , puis que rien n'est infini , auquel quelque chose peut être ajoutée , la succession de générations d'hommes depuis la Création

## 30 Of God's Existence.

*infinite and not infinite ; which is contradictory and impossible.*

*But some one will say, since God has been from all Eternity, what should hinder but that there might have been an equally continued succession of time together with his Eternal Duration?*

*I answer, that it is not properly affirmed of God, that he was heretofore, or shall be hereafter, but only that he is. For we see, that he himself in answer to Moses asking him what he should tell the People his name was, said, I am that I am. Thus shalt thou say to the Children of Israel, I am has sent me unto you. Exod. 3. 14. For, since Existence is essential to God, there is no divisibility, no Preterition, no Futurition, and consequently no succession, nor continuance (truly speaking) incident to him: those things*

du monde, seroit tout ensemble infinie, & non infinie ; ce qui est contradictoire & impossible.

Mais quelqu'un me dira, puisque Dieu a été de toute éternité, qu'est-ce qui empêche qu'il n'y ait eu une égale succession de temps ensemble avec sa durée éternelle ?

Je répond, qu'on ne dit pas proprement de Dieu, qu'il étoit cy-devant, ou qu'il sera cy-après, mais seulement qu'il est. Car nous remarquons que luy-même, répondant à Moïse, qui luy demanda son nom pour le declarer au Peuple d'Israël, dit, *Je suis celui qui suis.* Ainsi tu diras aux enfans d'Israël, *Je suis m'a envoyé à vous,* Exod.3.14. Car puis que l'Existence est essentielle à Dieu, il n'y a en luy ( à proprement parler ) ni division, ni passé, ni futur, ni succession, ni continuation : Car seulement à ces choses là, dont la  
Nature

## 32 Of God's Existence.

*things only, whose natures may be or may not be, can be rightly said to continue. But we cannot properly say of God, whose Essence is Existence, that he was or shall be, but solely that he is. For what is it essentially to Exist but solely to be. And to say a thing was or shall be, which solely is, amounts in effect to this, that it solely is, and not solely is, which is a thing impossible. Therefore from God's Existence a possibility of an eternal Duration, or continued succession of time cannot be inferred, there being no such thing as an Eternal Duration incident to the Divine Nature, which is essential pure Existence; so that these words, was or shall be, cannot in any sort be properly appropriated thereunto.*

*As*



Nature peut être, & ne pas être, la continuation peut être justement attribuée. Mais nous ne pouvons pas proprement dire de Dieu, dont l'Essence est Existence, qu'il a été, ou qu'il sera, mais seulement qu'il est : Car qu'est-ce qu'Exister essentiellement, sinon d'être seulement. Or de dire d'une chose qui est seulement, qu'elle étoit, ou qu'elle sera, c'est comme si l'on disoit, qu'elle est seulement, & qu'elle n'est pas seulement, ce qui est impossible. C'est pourquoy de l'Existence de Dieu nous ne pouvons pas inferer une durée éternelle, ou succession de temps continuée, ne se trouvant rien de semblable en la nature Divine, qui est une pure essentielle Existence ; de sorte que ces mots *étoit* ou *sera*, ne peuvent en aucune façon luy être proprement attribuez.

Comme

*As the world is not Eternal according to its Duration, so neither is it Infinite in respect of its Magnitude. For in case it were infinite in Greatness, the space from the center of the Earth towards the East, would be either finite or infinite; if infinite, then the space from the center of the Earth towards the West, North and South taken together, would not only be no greater than that towards the East (because one Infinite is no greater than another) but there would also be more infinite spaces in the Universe than one; neither of which is possible; not the former, because three equal spaces taken together are certainly greater than one alone, which is no greater than any one of them; nor the latter, because in regard the Universe is not greater than an infinite space, it cannot contain more infinite spaces than one; for otherwise*

Comme le monde n'est point éternel au respect de sa durée, ainsi n'est-il point infini à l'égard de sa magnitude. Car en cas qu'il fût infini en grandeur, l'espace depuis le centre de la Terre jusqu'à l'Orient, seroit, ou fini, ou infini; Si infini, alors l'espace depuis le centre de la Terre jusqu'à l'Occident, le Nord & le Midy, pris ensemble, ne seroit non seulement pas plus grand que celui de l'Occident (parce qu'un infini n'est pas plus grand qu'un autre) mais il y auroit aussi dans l'Univers plus d'un espace infini. L'un & l'autre n'est pas possible; le premier ne l'est pas, parce que trois espaces, qui sont égaux, & qui sont pris ensemble, sont certainement plus grands qu'un seul d'iceux; & le dernier aussi n'est pas possible; car puis que l'Univers n'est pas plus grand qu'un espace infini, il n'en peut pas contenir

## 36 Of God's Existence.

wise it should be greater than itself. But if the space from the center of the Earth towards the East were finite, then also the space from the center of the Earth towards the West, North, and South would be likewise finite; and of four finite spaces an infinite space cannot be made. It is then true, that the world is not infinite in its Extension. Wherefore it follows that the world is neither infinite in respect of its Duration, nor in respect of its greatness, and consequently that it is not God, but derived from him in all its parts.

Philo, to prove that there is a God, argues thus; nothing made by Art, can come by chance; but the world is done with exquisite Art; therefore it must needs be made by one that is the most perfect of all Artists, and that is God.

The

contenir plus qu'un, car autrement il seroit plus grand que luy-même. Et si l'espace, depuis le centre de la Terre jusqu'à l'Orient, étoit fini, alors l'espace, depuis le centre de la Terre jusqu'à l'Occident, le Nord & le Midy, le seroit pareillement; or de quatre espaces finis, on n'en peut pas faire une infini. Il est donc vray que le Monde n'est pas infini dans son extension. C'est pourquoy il s'ensuit que l'Univers n'est ni infini au respect de sa durée, ni au respect de sa grandeur; & conséquemment qu'il n'est pas Dieu, mais derivé de luy en chacune de ses Parties.

*Philon*, pour prouver qu'il y a un Dieu, argumente en ces termes. Tout ce qui est fait par Art, n'arrive point par hazard; or le Monde est fait par Art; Donc il est fait par le plus excellent de tous les Artistes, sçavoir Dieu.

E

Le

### 38 Of God's Existence.

*The first knowledge of God, saith Tertullian, we derive from Nature, the next by Doctrine. That from Nature we learn by his works; and that by Doctrine from Preaching.*

*We are all of us, saith Julian to Heraclitus, though untaught naturally perswaded that there is a God, unto whom we look, unto whom we run, and towards whom our Souls do as naturally turn as our Eyes to the Light. or as the Needle to the North. Plutarch calls the believing of a God an ancient Perswasion, than which nothing can be more certain: And Aristotle saith, that all Men have naturally some Perswasion, that there is a God.*

Tully

La premiere connoissance que nous avons de Dieu, dit *Tertulien*, nous la tirons de la Nature ; & la seconde de la Doctrine. Celle que nous avons de la Nature, nous l'apprenons par ses ouvrages ; & celle que nous avons par la Doctrine, nous l'apprenons par la Predication.

Toustant que nous sommes, dit *Julian à Heraclitus*, quoy que non enseignez, nous sommes naturellement persuadez qu'il y a un Dieu, lequel nous regardons, auquel nous courons, & vers lequel nos ames se tournent aussi naturellement, que nos yeux vers la lumiere, ou que l'aiguille tourne au Nord. *Plutarque* dit que la croyance d'un Dieu, est une ancienne persuasion, dont il n'y a rien de plus certain au Monde ; Et *Aristote* assure que tous les hommes ont naturellement quelque persuasion, qu'il y a un Dieu,

## 40 Of God's Existence.

Tully tells us of a speech of Aristotle to this purpose. If we could suppose, saith he, Persons to have lived in some Caverns of the Earth, and to have enjoyed every thing there of Pleasure, and Riches, or whatever can render a Man happy in this Life; and had never been abroad upon the surface of the Earth, but had only had some obscure report of an Infinite Being; and that afterwards these Persons should come out of those Caverns, and should immediately behold, the Earth, the Sea, the Heaven, and observe the Vastness of the Clouds, and violence of winds, the Beauty and Influence of the Sun, and how the day depend upon his Presence; and upon his withdrawing should view the face of the Heavens again, the order and ornament of the Stars, the light of the Moon, their Rising and Setting, and their fixed and immovable courses, they could



*Tullius* nous parle d'une Harangue d'*Aristote* sur ce sujet. Si nous pouvions, dit-il, supposer, que des personnes ont vécu long-temps dans des cavernes sous terre, & que là ils ont jouï de tous les plaisirs & avantages, & de tout ce qui peut rendre un homme heureux en cette vie; & qu'ils n'ont jamais vû la surface de la terre, mais seulement eu une legere Relation d'un Etre infini; & qu'ensuite sortant de leurs cavernes, ils vissent incontinent la Terre, la Mer, les Cieux, & qu'ils observassent la grandeur des Nüées, la violence des vents, la beauté & influence du Soleil, & comme le jour depend de sa presence; & qu'en son absence ils considerassent encore les Cieux, l'ordre & l'ornement des Etoiles & de la Lune; leur lever, leur coucher, & leur cours fixe & immuable, ils ne pouroient pas s'empêcher de croi-

42      Of God's Existence.

*could not hold from believing there was a Deity, and that these admirable things were the effects of his Power.*

*For to think, as many have thought, that this world came by chance, and by the juttlings of the Atoms one with another, is a piece of nonsense; for I could as well say, that in juttling together all the Letters, that are in a Printer's-House, they could fall so handsomely in order, that they could compose the Bible or the whole Book of Virgil, as we have them at this present.*

*The invisible things of God, saith St. Paul, Rom. I. 20. from the Creation of the World are clearly seen, being understood by the things, that are made, even his Eternal Power, and God-head, so that they are without excuse.*

*For*

re, qu'il n'y eût une Divinité, & que toutes ces belles choses, qu'ils ont vûes, sont les effets de la Puissance.

Car de penser, ainsi que l'ont cru plusieurs, que ce grand Monde soit venu par hazard, & par le mouvement des Atomes les uns avec les autres, c'est ce qui ne peut entrer dans ma raison; parce que je pourois dire aussi, qu'en remuant toutes les lettres qui se rencontrent dans une Imprimerie, elles pouroient par hazard tomber dans un si bel ordre, qu'elles composeroient toute la Bible, ou tout le Livre de Virgile, ainsi que nous les avons à present.

*Les choses invisibles de Dieu, dit Saint Paul, Rom. I. 20. tant sa puissance éternelle que sa divinité, se voyent comme à l'œil depuis la creation du Monde, étant considérées en ses ouvrages, afin qu'ils soient rendus inexcusables. Car et-  
les*

## 44 Of God's Existence.

*For they are all like Christal-glasses, which give a clear representation of the Existence of a Deity; like that Mirrour reported to be in a Temple in Arcadia, which represented to the Spectator, not his own Face, but the Image of that Deity, which he worshipped.*

*I will not relate here, to prove the Existence of one God, the general consent of all Nations; a powerful Argument, since it is not likely that either they would be all deceived, or that they would all agree together to cheat the whole world. I will only make use of the wonderful Miracles, that have been wrought and seen; as the raining of Manna in the Wilderness, to feed the Israelites during so many years; the stopping of the waves of the Red-Sea, that they might pass-over, and so avoid Pharaoh's pursuit; the raising of the Dead; the giving*  
Sight

les sont toutes comme des verres de cristal, qui donnent une claire représentation de l'Existence d'un Dieu; elles sont semblables à ce Miroir, qu'on dit avoir été dans un Temple en *Arcadie*, qui représentoit au spectateur, non son propre visage, mais l'image de cette Divinité qu'il adoroit.

Je ne veux pas icy rapporter, pour prouver l'Existence d'un Dieu, le consentement général de toutes les Nations; Argument très-fort, puis qu'il n'est pas probable, ou qu'elles voulussent toutes être trompées, ou qu'elles voulussent s'accorder ensemble pour tromper tout le Monde. Je me serviray seulement des prodigieux Miracles, qui ont été faits & vus, comme la pluie de la Manne dans le Desert, pour nourrir les Israélites durant plusieurs années; l'arrêtèment des vagues de la Mer Rouge, afin qu'ils pus-

sent

*Sight to those, that were born Blind; the Curing all manner of Diseases, and several other miraculous things, which could not be done by any natural Power, and which consequently were wrought by a supernatural and Divine Being.*

*Let us then conclude this Chapter by granting that there is a God, and that the Heaven, the Sea, the Earth, and all that is therein, are the wonderful works of his Almighty Power. For who knows not in all these that the hand of the Lord has wrought this? Job 12. 9. And it is what Moses assures us of in the beginning of Genesis.*

sent passer, & ainsi éviter la poursuite de Pharaon ; les Morts Resuscitez ; la vüe donnée à ceux qui étoient nez aveugles ; la guérison de toutes sortes de Maladies, & plusieurs autres choses miraculeuses, qui ne se pouvoient pas faire par aucun pœuvoir naturel, & qui par conséquent ont été faites par un Etre surnaturel & Divin.

Concluons donc ce Chapitre, en avouant qu'il y a un Dieu, & que les Cieux, la Mer, la Terre, & tout ce qui est en iceux, sont l'ouvrage admirable de sa toute Puissance. *Car qui ne sçait en toutes ces choses, que c'est la main du Seigneur qui a fait cela ?* Job 12. 9. C'est ce dont nous assure Moïse au commencement de la Genèse.

## C H A P. II.

## Of the Certainty of the Holy Scriptures.

**B**Y the Holy Scriptures we do understand the Old and New Testament, which we call the Bible; if then I make it appear, that the one and the other have been revealed of God, I shall consequently shew the certainty of the Holy Scriptures; For, since God cannot lye, every one is certain, that whatsoever is revealed by him, is true.

And that the old Testament, which was given us by Moses, and that the new, which we have received from Jesus Christ, have been  
both



## C H A P. II.

*De la Certitude des Saintes  
Ecritures.*

**P**Ar les Saintes Ecritures, nous entendons l'Ancien & le Nouveau Testament, que nous appellons la Bible ; Si donc je fais voir, que l'un & l'autre nous ont été revelez de Dieu, je feray voir consequemment la certitude des Saintes Ecritures ; Car Dieu ne pouvant mentir, chacun est assuré que tout ce qui est révéle par luy, est veritable.

Or que l'Ancien Testament, qui nous a été donné par Moïse, & que le Nouveau, que nous avons reçu de Jesus Christ, ont été tous deux revelez par Dieu ; c'est ce  
F que

50 Of the Certainty, &c.  
both revealed by God, is what I  
shall endeavour to prove evidently.

If then I make it appear, that  
there was such a Man as Moses;  
that he gave the Law, which we  
read in the Old Testament, and that  
he was at that time inspired by God,  
I then shall shew the certainty of  
his Writings.

I. I prove that there was such  
a Man as Moses. No body expects  
I should prove it by Mathematical  
Demonstration, or as evidently as  
two and two make four. But I shew  
it by the same way as we shew, that  
we have a right to an Estate, be-  
cause we have the Titles of it from  
our Ancestors: Or as we prove,  
that there is a place of great Trade,  
called East-Indies; or that there was  
a Man called Alexander, and ano-  
ther called Cæsar, both because se-  
veral Authors worthy to be believed,  
speak of them, and because we find  
their

que je tâcheray de prouver évidemment.

Si donc je montre qu'il y avoit un tel homme, appellé Moïse; qu'il nous a donné la Loy, que nous lisons dans l'Ancien Testament, & qu'alors il a été inspiré de Dieu, je feray voir en même temps la certitude de ses Ecrits.

1. Je fais voir qu'il y avoit un tel homme, appellé Moïse. Il ne faut pas que vous attendiez que je le montre par une demonstration Mathematique, ou aussi clairement que deux & deux font quatre; mais je le montre de la maniere que nous montrons, que nous avons droit à un heritage, parce que nous en avons les Titres de nos Ancestres; ou que nous prouvons qu'il y a une place de grand Trafic, qu'on appelle les Indes Orientales; ou qu'il y avoit autrefois un homme nommé Alexandre, & un autre nommé Cesar; parce

*their names in the History. For, if we will believe nothing but what we have seen our selves; we must destroy all the Historical faith out of the world, though it were given us by very good Authors, and altogether worthy to be believed. Wherefore, since all the Historians say, that there was such a Man as Moses, and is granted by the universal consent of them, that lived in his time, we ought to believe it, and we have all the Proofs, that can be given at present upon such an account. And he that should deny, that there was such a Person as Moses, would be as unreasonable, as he that should deny, that there was such a Person as Charles the First King of England; and that there was a Civil War between him and the Parliament.*

que plusieurs Autheurs dignes de  
foy en ont parlé, & que nous  
trouvons leurs noms dans les Hi-  
stoires. Car si nous ne voulons rien  
croire que ce que nous avons vû  
nous mêmes, il faut que nous ban-  
nissions toute la foy historique,  
bien qu'elle nous ait été doannée  
par de graves Autheurs, & entie-  
rement dignes d'être crus. C'est  
pourquoy, puis que tous les Histo-  
riens font mention, qu'il y avoit  
un homme nommé Moïse, & que  
cela nous est assuré par tous ceux  
qui vivoient de son temps, nous  
sommes obligez de le croire, &  
nous avons toutes les preuves,  
qu'on en peut à present donner  
sur ce sujet. Et celuy qui nieroit,  
qu'il y avoit une telle personne  
que Moïse, seroit aussi déraison-  
nable que celuy qui nieroit qu'il n'y  
avoit pas une telle personne que  
Charles I. Roy d'Angleterre, &  
qu'il n'y avoit point de guerre Ci-  
vile entre luy & le Parlement.

54      Of the Certainty, &c.

2. That he gave the Law, which we read in the Old Testament, I prove it both by the universal consent of those Persons, who were best able to know the Truth of the things in question, and by the settling of a Common-wealth upon the Laws delivered by Moses.

I know nothing the most scrupulous and inquisitive mind can possibly desire in order to satisfaction, concerning any matter of Fact beyond an universal consent of such Persons, who have a greater capacity of knowing the truth of it, than we can have; and have lived nearest those times, when that thing was done. If the Jews, who were so exceedingly prone to transgress the Law of Moses, and to fall into Idolatry, had had the least suspicion of any Falsity or Imposture of this Law, they would have promulged it amongst

2. Que cette Loy, que nous lisons dans l'Ancien Testament, nous a été donnée par luy ; c'est ce que je fais voir aussi, & par le consentement universel des personnes qui étoient les plus capables de juger de la verité des choses qui étoient en question ; & par l'établissement d'une Republique sur les Loix delivrées par Moïse.

Je ne vois rien qui puisse tant satisfaire un esprit douteux & inquisitif, touchant une chose de fait, que le consentement général de ces personnes, qui ont une plus grande capacité que nous, pour en connoître la verité ; & qui ont vécu dans le tems, ou peu de tems après que cette chose a été faite. Si les Juifs, qui étoient fort enclinez à transgresser la Loy de Moïse, & à tomber dans l'idolatrie, eussent eu le moindre soupçon de la fausseté ou imposture de cette Loy, ils n'auroient pas manqué de le  
publier

56 Of the Certainty, &c.

mongst the People, especially when they revolted against him, and would not worship the true God. And we do not find even in their Rebellion and frequent Apostasies, that they in the least questioned whether the Law of Moses was true or no. They did constantly believe it, and would sooner part with their Lives and Fortunes than admit any variation or alteration as to this Law.

What was the reason, that the neighbour Nations about the Jews, notwithstanding they hated their Religion, yet retained so venerable an opinion of the wisdom of Moses? It was because of his writings, and the Law he had given to his People. Among the famous Legislators Diodorus Siculus speaks of Moses with great respect; Strabo doth commend him because of the Religion established by him. Longinus gives us this assurance, that he was no  
Man



publier au peuple , particuliere-  
ment lors qu'ils se revoltoient con-  
tre luy , & qu'ils ne vouloient pas  
adorer le veritable Dieu. Et nous  
ne trouvons pas, même parmi leurs  
Revoltes & frequentes Apostasies,  
qu'ils mettent en doute, si la Loy  
de Moïse est veritable ou non. Ils  
la croyoient tous constamment, &  
aimoient mieux perdre leurs biens  
& leur vie , que d'admettre au-  
cune alteration dans cette Loy.

Quelle étoit la raison que les  
voisins des Juifs, nonobstant qu'ils  
les haïssent à cause de leur Re-  
ligion , avoient pourtant tant de  
respect pour la Sageſſe de Moïse ?  
C'étoit à cause de ses Ecrits , &  
de la Loy qu'il avoit donnée à son  
Peuple. Parmi tous les fameux  
Legislateurs , Diodorus Siculus  
parle de Moïse avec beaucoup de  
veneration ; & Strabo le recom-  
mande à cause de la Religion qu'il  
a établie. Longinus assure qu'il  
n'étoit

*Man of any vulgar wit. And Justin Martyr, Cyrill and several others do certifie, that if the Law, which is attributed unto Moses, had not been certainly his, it could never have been received in so universal a Tradition, nor conveyed down in a continual succession from his time to our present Age.*

*which will be yet more clear, if we consider, that the Common-wealth of the Jews did depend on the Laws and writings of Moses, as the Common-wealths of Athens, Sparta and Rome did depend on the Laws of Solon, Licurgus and Numa; and that these Common-wealths were governed by their Laws, as are now the Jews governed by those of Moses. For their right to their temporal successions in the Land of Canaan, with the Promises made to their Patriarchs, did depend both on the Sovereignty of God who gave them*

n'étoit pas un homme du commun ; & Justin Martyr , Cyrille & plusieurs autres nous disent, que si la Loy , qu'on attribüe à Moïse, ne nous avoit pas été donnée par luy , elle n'auroit jamais été receüe avec une si generale Tradition , & ne seroit pas venue jusqu'à nous par une continuelle succession.

Ce qui paroîtra encore plus clairement , si nous considerons , & que la Republique des Juifs dependoit de la Loy ou des Ecrits de Moïse , ainsi que les Republiques d'Athenes , de Sparte & de Rome dependoient des Loix de Solon , de Licurgue , & de Numa ; & que ces Republiques étoient gouvernées par leurs Loix , comme le sont encore aujourd'huy les Juifs par celles de Moïse. Car le droit qu'ils avoient d'heriter la terre de Canaan , avec les promesses qui en étoient faites aux Patriarches, dependoit

60 Of the Certainty, &c.

to them, and on the Truth of the History recorded by Moses. It is then without any doubt, that this Law, which we read in the Old Testament, was given us by him.

3. And that he was inspired by God, when he gave us his Law, is what remains to be proved: which if it be made clear, then all our doubts must presently cease. For, if we suppose a God, as I have evidently made it appear, it is certain, that since veracity is one of his chiefest Attributes, all that he reveals us by a Man imployed upon that account, ought to be very true. And that God has imployed Moses to reveal us his Law, which we now read in the Old Testament, is that which will appear by the Miracles he did; for the doing of things above the reach of our nature has been always

dependoit , & de la Souveraineté de Dieu , qui la leur donna , & de la verité de l'Histoire , que nous lisons dans la Loy de Moïse. Il est donc sans aucun doute , que cette Loy , que nous lisons dans l'Ancien Testament , nous a été donnée par luy.

3. Et qu'il étoit inspiré de Dieu , quand il nous a donné sa Loy , c'est ce qui me reste à prouver ; ce que , si je fais voir , incontinent tous nos doutes cesseront. Car , si nous supposons un Dieu , comme on n'en peut plus douter , il est certain que la verité étant un de ses principaux attributs , tout ce qu'il nous revele par un homme , qu'il employe pour cet effet , doit être entièrement véritable. Or que Dieu ait employé Moïse pour nous révéler sa Loy , que nous lisons dans l'Ancien Testament , c'est ce qui paroît par les Miracles qu'il a faits ; car de faire des choses qui

G

sont

62 Of the Certainty, &c.

*as the greatest Testimony of divine Authority and Revelation. It is then very certain, that where is found such a Power, there is also found God, who gives this Power. And seeing Moses did many Miracles for the confirmation of his Law, it is a certain proof it was revealed to him by God, and that he was with him, when he gave it us.*

*For Moses, as we may read in the 4th. chapter of Exodus, supposing, saith he unto God, that I should go to the Israelites, and tell them, God had appeared unto me, and sent me to deliver them; and they should say, God had not appeared unto me, how should I satisfy them? The Lord shews him how he should satisfy them, by causing, (said he unto him) a Miracle before their faces, turning thy Rod into a Serpent,*

sont au dessus du pouvoir de nôtre nature, cela a toujours été reçu comme un très-grand témoignage de la divine autorité & Revelation. Il est donc certain que là où se trouve un tel pouvoir, là se trouve aussi Dieu, qui donne ce pouvoir. Or puis que Moïse a fait plusieurs Miracles pour confirmer sa Loy, c'est une preuve certaine, qu'elle luy a été révélée par Dieu, & qu'il étoit avec luy alors qu'il nous la donna.

Car Moïse, ainsi que nous pouvons lire au 4. chapitre de l'Exode, supposant, dit-il à Dieu, que j'aille aux Israélites, & que je leur die, que Dieu m'a apparu, & qu'il m'a envoyé pour les delivrer; & qu'ils répondent que Dieu ne m'a pas apparu, comment les satisferay-je? Le Seigneur luy montre, comment il les satisfera; en faisant, luy dit-il, un Miracle en leur presence, changeant ta verge

64 Of the Certainty, &c.

pent, which is a sufficient reason to make them believe, that the Lord God of their Fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac and Jacob has appeared unto thee. God thought this would be the greatest evidence of his appearing to him, if he wrought a Miracle before their faces. And lest they should think one single Miracle was not sufficient, God adjoins two more to satisfy them, which he commanded him to do before Pharaoh as we may read. *Exod. 7. 9.*

*And when God gave his Law to Moses upon the Mount Sinai, he confirmed it by the Thundrings and the Lightnings, and the noise of the Trumpet, and the Mountain Smoaking, which were heard and seen by all the People, and which frightened them so much that they said to Moses, speak thou with us, but let*



en un serpent, qui est une raison suffisante pour leur faire croire, que le Seigneur Dieu de leurs Peres, le Dieu d'Abraham, d'Isaac, & de Jacob t'a apparu. Dieu a pensé que ce seroit une grande preuve, qu'il luy étoit apparu, s'il faisoit un Miracle devant leurs yeux. Et de peur qu'ils ne pensassent qu'un tel Miracle n'étoit pas suffisant, Dieu y en ajoute deux autres pour les satisfaire, & qu'il luy commande de faire en la presence de Pharaon, ainsi que vous pouvez voir, *Exod. 7. 9.*

Et quand Dieu donna sa Loy à Moïse sur le Mont Sinaï, alors il la confirma par les Tonnerres & par les Eclairs, & par le bruit des Trompetes, & par la fumée de la montagne, qui furent vûs & entendus de tout le Peuple, & qui les épouvanterent si fort, qu'ils dirent à Moïse, *parle toy à nous, & nous t'écouterons; mais que Dieu*

66      Of the Certainty, &c.  
let not God speak with us, lest  
we Die, Exod. 20. 18, 19.

*It is then certain, without mentioning here the other Miracles that Moses wrought both in Egypt and in the wilderness; and especially in their deliverance out of the bondage of Pharaoh, that in confirmation of his Law he wrought several Miracles, which could not be done by any natural Power; and he was consequently inspired by God, and therefore that the Holy Scripture, called the Old Testament, which was given us by Moses, was revealed by God.*

*So we may say of the other Prophets, which we read in the Old Testament, when they gave us Instructions, Reproofs, Warnings, and Predictions; which, when fulfilled, did plainly shew, that they had been revealed to them by God.*

*And*

*ne nous parle point , de peur que nous ne mourions, Exod. 20. 18, 19.*

Il est donc certain , sans faire icy mention des autres Miracles, que Moïse fit dans l'Egypte & dans le Desert , particulièrement pour les delivrer de la servitude de Pharaon ; puis que pour confirmer sa Loy , il a fait beaucoup de Miracles , qui ne pouvoient pas être faits par aucun pouvoir naturel, qu'il a été conséquemment inspiré de Dieu , & partant que la Sainte Ecriture, appelée l'Ancien Testament , qui nous a été donnée par Moïse , a été révélée par Dieu.

Ainsi pouvons nous dire des autres Prophetes , que nous lisons dans l'Ancien Testament , quand ils nous ont donné des Instructions, reprimandes , admonitions & Predictions ; lesquelles , quand elles ont été accomplies, ont fait voir clairement qu'elles leur avoient été révélées de Dieu.

Et

68 Of the Certainty, &c.

*And that the New, which we have received from Jesus Christ, is also revealed by God, is what remains to be proved.*

*Jesus Christ came down from Heaven to take away the Ceremonial Laws of the Jews, and to give us a new one; for the confirmation of which the Jews inquiring after a sign, our Saviour doth not reject their inquiry as in itself unreasonable, but as made in an unreasonable manner. For they would not be contented with the Miracles he wrought, which sufficiently manifested his supernatural Power, and that he was sent from God: But they desired a sign from Heaven, such as were done at the giving of the Law of Moses, viz. The Thundrings and Lightnings; or such as was the raining of the Manna in the Wilderness. Jesus Christ justly checks this Demand as importune*  
and

Et que le Nouveau, que nous avons reçu de Jesus Christ, ait aussi été révélé par Dieu ; c'est ce qui me reste à faire voir.

Jesus Christ est descendu du Ciel pour abolir les Loix Ceremonielles des Juifs, & pour nous en donner une nouvelle, pour la confirmation de laquelle les Juifs demandants un signe, nôtre Seigneur ne rejette pas leur demande, comme étant en soy irraisonnable, mais comme étant proposée d'une maniere qui ne sembloit pas avoir de raison. Car ils n'étoient pas contents des Miracles qu'il avoit faits, bien qu'ils manifestassent suffisamment son Pouvoir surnaturel, & qu'il avoit été envoyé de Dieu : mais ils vouloient un signe du Ciel, tels qu'étoient ceux qui arriverent quand Moïse leur donna la Loy ; sçavoir les Tonnerres & les Eclairs, ou tel qu'étoit la pluye de la Manne, lors qu'ils étoient dans le  
De-

and impudent, not only because he knew upon what account they asked it, which was meerly to tempt him, but also because he had wrought in their presence several miraculous Cures, which were more suitable for the confirmation of his Law, than ever were the Thundrings and Lightnings for the confirmation of that of Moses. wherefore he charges them with Hypocrisie, because they required a Prodigy rather than a Miracle; And he told them, an Evil and adulterous Generation seeks after a sign, and there shall no sign be given it but that of the Prophet Jonas, Mat. 12. They seek to have their Humours gratified more than their Faith confirmed; but they shall not be by me thus satisfied: for I have done enough already to perswade them, if they had any heart to believe. And we must not doubt of it, since Jesus  
Christ

Desert. Jesus Christ rejette leur demande comme importune & impudente, non seulement parce qu'il sçavoit la raison pourquoy il la luy demandoient, qui étoit de le tenter; mais encore parce qu'il avoit fait en leur présence plusieurs guérisons miraculeuses, qui étoient plus convenables pour confirmer sa Loy, que n'étoient les Tonnerres & les Eclairs pour confirmer celle de Moïse. C'est pourquoy il les accuse d'hypocrisie, parce qu'ils demandoient un signe plutôt qu'un miracle; Et il dit, *La Nation méchante & adulateuse recherche un signe, mais elle n'en aura point d'autre que celui du Prophete Jonas*, Mat. 12. Ils desirerent d'avoir leurs humeurs satisfaites, plutôt que d'avoir leur foy confirmée; mais ils ne seront pas ainsi par moy satisfaits: car j'ay déjà fait assez pour les persuader, s'ils avoient voulu croire.

Et

72 Of the Certainty, &c.

Christ did then those Miracles, which no Man else had done before, no not Moses nor Elias, in curing all manner of diseases by the word of his mouth. It is true, that Moses fed them with bread from Heaven; but Jesus Christ with seven small Loaves fed many Thousands. Elias indeed raised one from the dead, but Christ raised more, and even one after he had been four days in the Grave, and was stinking. And upon this Evidence of our Saviour's Miracles, which were in abundance, we find many believing in him. So Nicodemus, who came first to Christ, was perswaded, that he was a great Prophet sent from God; because no Man could do the Miracles, which he did, unless God were with him. And though the Jews did not look on him to be the Messias; yet some believed in him, upon the account  
of



Et il n'en faut point douter, puis que Jesus Christ fit alors des miracles, que jamais homme ne fit auparavant (non pas même Moïse ni Elie) en guérissant toutes sortes de maladies par sa parole. Il est vray que Moïse nourrit les Juifs avec le pain du Ciel; mais Jesus Christ avec sept petits pains nourrit plusieurs milles personnes. Elie resuscita un mort, & Jesus Christ en a resuscité plusieurs, & même un qui avoit été quatre jours dans le tombeau, & qui déjà sentoit mauvais. Et à cause des grands miracles que Jesus Christ faisoit, & qui étoient en abondance, nous trouvons que plusieurs se convertissoient à luy. Ainsi Nicodemus, qui se convertit le premier, fut persuadé qu'il étoit un grand Prophete envoyé de Dieu; parce que personne ne pouvoit faire les miracles qu'il faisoit, à moins que Dieu ne fût avec luy. Et quoy que les

H

Juifs

74 Of the Certainty, &c.

of his Miracles, and said, when Christ cometh, will he do more Miracles than these, which this Man has done? If this Man were not of God, said the blind Man, whom Christ had cured, he could do nothing, John 9. 29. as though he had said, is it not plain, that this Man is imployed by God in the world by the Miracles he doth? For otherwise God would not so readily assist him in his miraculous Actions. For we know, continues the Man that was blind, that God heares not Sinners, but if any Man be a worshipper of God, and doth his will, him he heareth. If this Man were not truly sent from God, can we think he would assist him in his Miracles? We know by our Law, if one comes with a Commission from God, and draws not Men to Idolatry, such a one God is present with, and we are bound to believe him. And as  
for

Juifs ne crussent pas qu'il étoit le Messie, néanmoins quelques-uns crurent en luy à cause de ses grands miracles, & dirent, lors que le Christ viendra, fera-t-il de plus grands miracles que ceux que cét homme à faits ? Si cét homme n'étoit pas de Dieu, dit l'aveugle, que Jesus Christ avoit guéri, il ne pouroit rien faire, Jean 9. 29. C'est comme s'il eût dit ; n'est-il pas évident que cét homme est employé de Dieu dans le monde par les grands miracles qu'il y fait ? Car autrement Dieu ne seroit pas si prompt à l'assister dans ses actions miraculeuses. Car nous sçavons, continue l'homme qui étoit aveugle, que Dieu n'exauce point les pecheurs : mais si quelqu'un adore Dieu & fait sa volonté, alors il l'écoute & l'exauce. Si cét homme n'étoit pas véritablement envoyé de Dieu, pouvons nous penser qu'il voulût l'as-

76 Of the Certainty, &c.

for the Miracles, which he has done, by giving sight to one born blind, was the like ever heard of before? Did ever Moses and the Prophets do such a thing? How strangely irrational were the Jews then in rejecting our Saviour, since his Miracles exceeded those of Moses both in number and quality; and since they were themselves Eye-witnesses of them, having received those of Moses only upon the credit of their Fathers. This made St. Peter tell the Jews, as it is written in the 2. Chapter of the Acts, that Jesus of Nazareth was a Man approved of God among them by Miracles, wonders and Signs, which God did by him in the midst of them, as they themselves also knew. He appeals to their knowledge, which he would not certainly have done, had it not been a Case beyond all dispute among them; and which  
was

sister dans ses miracles ? Nous sommes assurez par nôtre Loy, si quelqu'un est envoyé de Dieu & ne fait point commettre l'idolatrie, que Dieu est avec un tel homme, & nous sommes obligez de le croire : Et quant au miracle qu'il a fait, en rendant la veüe à un aveugle né, a-t-on jamais oui une chose semblable auparavant ? Moïse & les Prophetes ont-ils jamais fait une telle chose ? Combien donc irraisonnables étoient les Juifs de réjetter nôtre Sauveur, puis que ses miracles surpassoient ceux de Moïse, & en nombre & en qualité, & qu'ils en furent eux-mêmes les témoins oculaires, n'ayant vû ceux de Moïse que par la croyance qu'ils avoient receüe de leurs Ancêtres. C'est ce qui fit que S. Pierre dit aux Juifs, ainsi qu'il est marqué au second chapitre des Actes, que Jesus Christ de Nazareth étoit un homme ap-

78      Of the Certainty, &c.

*was so notorious, that even the Pharisees, confessing him, could not hold from saying, what do we do, for this Man doth many Miracles?*

*Now in this Nation of Jews, whose Religion had been established by the Miracles of Moses, what could Jesus Christ do more to shew them, that the new Law, called the New Testament, had been revealed to him by God, than to confirm it by greater Miracles? And by this very reason the primitive Christians were perswaded of the Doctrine of the Apostles, because they had been*

prouvé de Dieu par Miracles, par Prodiges & par Signes, que Dieu avoit faits par luy au milieu d'eux, ainsi qu'ils le sçavoient eux-mêmes. Il en appelle à leur connoissance; ce qu'il n'auroit certainement pas fait, si ce qu'il leur disoit, n'eût été sans aucun doute, & qui étoit si manifeste, que les Pharisiens mêmes le confessant, ne purent pas s'empêcher de professer ces paroles, *Qu'est-ce que nous faisons? Car cét homme fait plusieurs miracles.*

Or dans cette Nation des Juifs, dont la Religion avoit été établie par les miracles de Moïse; qu'est-ce que pouvoit faire davantage Jesus Christ, pour leur montrer que la nouvelle Loy, appelée le Nouveau Testament, luy avoit été revelée de Dieu, finon de la confirmer par de plus grands miracles? Et c'est par cette même raison que les premiers Chrétiens ont été

80 Of the Certainty, &c.

been all Eye-witnesſes of his Miracles. For what could thoſe Perſons, who were not preſent at the doing of theſe Miracles, deſire but a faithful Report of them, that were then preſent and beheld them, and who did afterwards made it appear in the World, that they had no intention of deceiving them. For they preached us nothing but what they ſaw and heard, and have afterwards ſealed with their own Blood.

What delight is there in Racks and Priſons? What Pleaſure is there among Flames? And what is there ſo deſirable in dying upon wheels and Scaffolds? Nevertheless, though all the Apoſtles did very well know, that they were to undergo all theſe cruel pains, for the Preaching of this new Law, which Jeſus Chriſt brought into the World, yet they were



été convaincus de la Doctrine des Apôttes, parce qu'ils avoient tous été témoins oculaires de ses miracles. Car qu'est-ce que pouvoient desirer ceux qui n'avoient été présent à ces Prodiges, sinon un fidelle raport de ceux qui les avoient contemplez, & qui ont ensuite fait paroître au monde, qu'ils n'avoient aucune intention de les tromper. Car ils ne nous ont rien Prêché, & publié que ce qu'ils ont vû & entendu, & qu'ils n'ayent tous Sëellé de leur Sang.

Quel plaisir y a t-il dans les Tortures & dans les Prisons ? Quel plaisir y a-t-il parmi les Flames ? Et quelle satisfaction y a t-il de perdre la vie sur des Rouës & des Echafaux ? Neanmoins, quoy que tous les Apôtres sçeussent fort bien, qu'ils devoient souffrir toutes ces crüelles choses pour la publication de la Loy nouvelle, que Jesus Christ avoit apportée au monde ;

82 Of the Certainty, &c.

were willing to endure them constantly rather than to disown this Law before their Persecutors.

*We cannot find out any reason, which could induce the Apostles to suffer so much, and at last lose their lives, but the full conviction of their minds of the undoubted Truth and Doctrine, which they Preached to the world. For they knew, that what Moses said in the 18. Chapter of Deuteronomy, was spoken of Christ, when he said, The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet, from the midst of thee of thy Brethren, like unto me, unto him ye shall hearken, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. Deut. 18. 15. 18, 19.*

*De la certitude des S. Ecritures.* 83

monde; ils ont pourtant mieux aimé les endurer constamment, que de denier cette Loy devant leurs Persecuteurs.

Il n'y a point d'autre raison, pour laquelle les Apôtres aient tant souffert, & enfin perdu leur vie, qu'une pleine conviction qu'ils avoient de la verité de la Doctrine qu'ils prêchoient au monde. Car ils sçavoient que c'étoit de Christ dont avoit parlé Moïse au 18. chapitre du Deuteronomie, quand il dit, *l'Eternel ton Dieu te suscitera un Prophete comme toy d'entre leurs freres, vous l'écouteriez.* Et il leur dira tout ce que je luy ay commandé. Et il aviendra que quiconque n'écouterà pas mes paroles, qu'il aura dites en mon nom, je luy en demanderay conte, Deuteronomie 18. 15. 18. 19.

## 84 Of the Immortality of, &c.

*It is then evident, that the Old and New Testament, or that the Laws of Moses and Jesus Christ have been revealed by God, and consequently that the Holy Scriptures are certain and true.*

---

### C H A P. III.

## Of the Immortality of our Souls.

**I** will not say that our Soul is Immortal, as Demonax in Lucian said, when he was asked, whether the Souls were Immortal or no. They are, said he, but as all things else are; for those, who make the Souls to be nothing but some more subtle and active particles of matter, do not think, that upon death they

Il est donc évident, que l'Ancien & Nouveau Testament, ou que les Loix de Moïse & de Jesus Christ nous ont été révélées par Dieu; & partant que les Saintes Ecritures sont certaines & véritables.

---

### CHAP. III.

*De l'Immortalité de nos Ames.*

**J**E ne veux pas dire que nôtre Ame est immortelle, comme Demonax dans Lucian, quand on luy demanda, si les ames étoient immortelles ou non. Elles le sont, dit-il, ainsi que le sont toutes les autres choses; car ceux qui soutiennent que les ames ne sont rien que les plus subtiles parties  
I de

86 Of the Immortality of, &c.  
they are annihilated, but that only  
they are dispersed and return to the  
Soul of the world. This way I can-  
not think to be sufficient Probation  
of the Immortality of our Souls. I  
will not here make use of the Pre-  
existence of our Souls, which tends  
to prove their Immortality. For  
whether the Souls of Men be pre-  
existent; whether they be by Tra-  
duction or by Creation, I do not  
examin these questions at present,  
but only prove, without considering  
which way our Souls are in our Bodies,  
that they are Immortal.

Man moves himself where ever  
he pleases, after what manner he  
pleases, and to whatsoever object  
he please, without being necessa-  
rily agitated by Sense, or Passion, or  
Phantasy,

de la matière, ne croient pas qu'elles soient annihilées au tems de la mort, mais qu'elles sont dispersées, & qu'elles retournent à l'ame du monde; car je ne pense pas que cecy soit suffisant pour prouver l'Immortalité de nos ames. Je ne veux pas aussi alleguer icy la pre existence de nos ames, qui sert beaucoup pour prouver son Immortalité. Car soit que l'ame de l'homme soit pre-existante, soit qu'elle existe par génération ou par création, c'est ce que je ne veux pas à present examiner; mais seulement prouver, sans considerer de qu'elle maniere nôtre ame est dans nos corps, qu'elle est Immortelle.

L'homme se meut où il veut, selon la maniere qu'il luy plaît, & à quelque objet que bon luy semble, sans y être nécessité par le Sens ou la Passion, ou l'Imagination, ainsi que sont toujours les

88 Of the Immortality of, &c.

Phantasy, as Brutes always are; and therefore he must have some Principle with him, which is not material: especially since he doth sometimes with great deliberateness and reason set himself to oppose what the animal part solicits and prompts him to; and prevails thereby against the allurements of sense, the assaults of Passion, and the Insinuations of Phansy. Which could not be, if there were nothing but corporeal substance, or the animal Life in Man; because matter, Sense, Passion, and Phansy make up the whole Animal. And it is not possible, that the same numerical matter, Sense, Passion or Phansy should have at the same time quite contrary motions, Inclinations or impulses crossing and opposing one another; and therefore it must be some other Principle residing in Man, which resists and masters  
his



Bêtes ; & partant il doit avoir en luy quelque principe , qui n'est pas materiel : particulièrement puis que quelquefois avec grande deliberation & raison il s'oppose à ce que la partie animale l'incline & sollicite ; & qu'il surmonte aussi les allechements de ses Sens , les assauts de les Passions , & les douces Insinuations de sa Phantaisie. Ce qui ne pouroit pas être , s'il n'y avoit rien en l'homme qu'une substance corporelle ou vie animale , d'autant que c'est la matiere , le Sens , la Passion & la Phantaisie , qui composent tout l'animal. Or il n'est pas possible qu'une même matiere numerique , qu'un même Sens , qu'une même Passion , & qu'une même Phantaisie aient en même temps des mouvemens tous differents , & des inclinations toutes contraires les unes aux autres ; & par consequent il faut de toute necessité qu'il y ait

90 Of the Immortality of, &c.  
his divers motions and different In-  
clinations.

There is then in Man something besides corporeal substance ; and consequently there is something in him, which is not subject to corruption, but is of an indissoluble and immortal nature. For, since corruption is the dissolution of a thing compounded : and dissolution is separation ; and separation, division ; which cannot be found but in something that is divisible. It is apparent, in regard nothing is divisible into separate parts but what is corporeal ; and that Man has a Principle of Nature in him which is not so ; that there is something in Man, which is incorruptible and Immortal, viz. this active Power or Principle, which we call the Soul.

And seeing we experience within our selves, that the Soul of Man  
has

en l'homme quelqu'autre Principe, qui refiste & s'oppose à ses divers mouvemens & différentes inclinations.

Il a y donc quelqu'autre chose en l'homme que la substance corporelle ; & conséquemment il y a en luy quelque chose qui n'est pas sujet à corruption, mais qui est d'une nature indissoluble & immortelle. Car, puis que la corruption est la dissolution du composé ; & que la dissolution est une separation, & que la separation est une division, qui ne peut se rencontrer que dans les choses divisibles, il s'ensuit, puis que rien n'est divisible que ce qui est corporel, & que l'homme a en luy un principe de nature qui n'est pas tel, qu'il y a quelque chose en l'homme qui est incorruptible & immortel, sçavoir ce Principe qui le fait agir, & que nous appellons Ame.

Et puis que nous experimenterons en nous mêmes, que l'ame de

92 Of the Immortality of, &c.

has a Faculty, which frames notions of things conceived by the Senses; and from these notions put together makes judgments; and from those judgments doth infer or find out some truth, whereof it was ignorant before, we say that it is rational, or endued with reason. For by reason we mean a Power in the mind of Man, which enables him to proceed from the knowledge of one thing to the knowledge of another, by the consequences made to that intent and purpose. The Soul then has a rational Faculty, whereby it discovers the truth of things; and this is usually called Understanding.

And for as much as the end of the knowledge of things we learn, is to discern what is convenient to Man, or what is inconvenient; and that it would be to small purpose, without this discernment, to obtain one, and to avoid the other;  
it

l'homme a une Puissance, qui forme des notions des choses qu'elle a conceûes par les sens; & que de ces notions jointes ensemble, elle fait des jugemens; & que de ces jugemens elle tire ou trouve des veritez, dont elle étoit auparavant ignorante, nous disons qu'elle est raisonnable ou doûée de raison. Car par la raison, nous entendons un pouvoir en l'esprit de l'homme, qui le rend capable de passer de la connoissance d'une chose, en la connoissance d'une autre par les conséquences qu'il en tire à cet effer. L'Ame a donc une faculté raisonnable, par laquelle elle découvre la verité des choses; & cette faculté est communement appelée entendement.

Et d'autant que la fin de la connoissance des veritez que nous apprenons, est de discerner ce qui est convenable à l'homme, & ce qui luy est desavantageux; & que sans ce discernement il ne luy ser-

94 Of the Immortality of, &c.  
*it follows evidently, that since God and Nature make nothing in vain, there is in Man a Faculty, by which the Soul is impowered to desire good for the acquiring of it, and to have an aversion to evil, for the avoiding of it. Which Faculty is called the will, or rational Appetite.*

*And because God and Nature make nothing in vain, and that our Soul cannot be satisfied with the things here below, and will never be contented until it enjoys God's Presence, according to these words of St. Austin, Irrequietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te. That is a certain Proof of its Immortality, otherwise God should have given her in vain the desire of enjoying him even after this Life.*

*And since there is nothing more  
engraven*

viroit de rien de tâcher d'obtenir l'un, & d'éviter l'autre : il s'ensuit clairement, puis que Dieu & la nature ne font rien en vain, qu'il y a en l'homme une faculté qui donne le pouvoir à l'ame de desirer ce qui est bon pour l'acquiescer, & d'abhorrer ce qui est mauvais pour l'éviter : laquelle Puissance est appelée volonté ou appetit raisonnable.

Or parce que Dieu & la Nature ne font rien en vain, & que nôtre ame ne peut pas être satisfaite des choses qui sont icy sur la terre ; & qu'elle ne sera jamais contente jusqu'à ce qu'elle jouisse de la presence de son Dieu, suivant ces paroles de S. Augustin, *Irrequietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te*, c'est une preuve certaine de son Immortalité, autrement Dieu luy auroit donné en vain le desir de jouir de sa presence après cette vie.

Et puis qu'il n'y a rien de plus

96 Of the Immortality of, &c.

engraven in the heart of Man than the desire to continue his Being, and to love God for ever; and seeing it is God, that gave him this desire, (for all that is good comes from God, and this desire is good) this desire must needs be accomplished, otherwise God should have given it him in vain. And seeing it is the will of God, that we should desire to continue our Being and to love him for ever, it is then his will, that our Soul be Immortal; for if it were mortal, then the desire it has to continue its Being and to love God for ever should cease, as soon as it should cease to be.

we see every day, that the wicked do commonly prosper in this world, whilst the just are usually afflicted and Poor. The reason in this is, because God, who is just, rewards in this world the wicked with temporal goods, by reason of some good actions they



fortement gravé dans le cœur de l'homme, que les desirs de continuer d'être, & d'aimer Dieu pour toujours. Et puis que c'est Dieu qui luy a donné ces desirs; (car tout ce qui est bon vient de Dieu, & ces desirs sont bons) il faut que ses desirs soient accomplis, autrement Dieu les luy auroit donnez en vain. Et puis que c'est la volonté de Dieu, que nous desirions de continuer d'Etre & de l'aimer toujours; c'est donc sa volonté que nôtre ame soit Immortelle, car si elle étoit mortelle, alors ces desirs, qu'elle a de continuer d'Etre & d'aimer Dieu pour toujours, cesseroient, dès lors qu'elle cesseroit d'Etre.

Nous voyons tous les jours, que communement les méchants prospèrent dans ce monde, tandis que les justes y sont très-souvent affligés. La raison est que Dieu, qui est juste, recompence en ce monde les méchants par quelques biens tem-

K

porels,

98 Of the Immortality of, &c.  
they have done; and punishes the  
just, because of some bad actions  
they have committed. And whereas  
the wicked die in their wickedness,  
and the just in God's Grace, he re-  
serves an Eternal Punishment in  
the other World for the former, and  
an everlasting Bliss for the latter.

Those, that will have the Soul  
of Man to be mortal, are grounded  
upon this supposition, that all sensa-  
tion in Man doth arise from corpe-  
real motion; and that the highest  
conceptions, which depend on senses,  
can amount no higher than Imagi-  
nation. But if I make it appear,  
that there is a Principle of action in  
Man, which proceeds in a diffe-  
rent way of operation than sensation  
doth; and that there are such ope-  
rations of our Soul, which do not  
proceed from Imagination, it will  
be

porels , à cause de quelques bonnes actions qu'ils y ont faites ; & punit les justes à raison de quelques mauvaises actions qu'ils ont commises. Et d'autant que les méchants meurent dans leur méchanceté, & les justes en la grace de Dieu , il reserve en l'autre monde une punition éternelle pour les premiers , & pour les derniers une félicité qui ne finira jamais.

Ceux qui veulent soutenir que l'ame de l'homme n'est pas Immortelle, sont fondez sur cette supposition, que toute sensation en l'homme provient du mouvement corporel ; & que les plus hautes conceptions, qui dependent des sens, ne peuvent monter plus haut que l'Imagination. Or si je fais voir, qu'il y a dans l'homme un principe d'action, qui est différent de la sensation, & qu'il y a des opérations de l'ame, qui ne viennent pas de l'Imagination,

K 2

tion,

100 Of the Immortality of, &c.

be then clear, that there is a Principle in Man, higher than matter and motion.

For if all our perceptions were nothing else but the Images of corporeal things left in the brain; the Judgment of the mind must of necessity be according to the impressions, which are made upon the organs of Sense. But now if our minds can and do form apprehensions of things quite different from those which are conveyed by sense, there must be a higher Principle of knowledge in Man than Imagination is.

And for the confirmation of this truth I make use of the Instance of the Sun. For if we judge according to the Image, which is conveyed to the brain by our Eyes, we can never imagin the Sun to be bigger than it seems to us to be. And though  
we

tion, alors il paroîtra qu'il y a dans l'homme un principe au dessus de la matiere, & du mouvement.

Car si les conceptions n'étoient rien autre chose que les Images des objets corporels qui demeurent dans le Cerveau ; il faut par nécessité que le jugement de l'ame soit suivant les impressions qui sont faites sur les Organes des Sens. Or si nos ames peuvent apprehender & conçoivent souvent des choses entierement differentes de celles qui sont envoyées par les Sens ; il faut qu'il y ait en l'homme un principe de connoissance, qui soit au dessus de son imagination.

Et pour confirmer cette verité, je me serviray de l'exemple du Soleil. Car si nous en jugeons selon l'image, qui de nos yeux est envoyée dans nôtre Cerveau, nous ne pouvons jamais nous imaginer que le Soleil soit plus grand qu'il

102 Of the Immortality of, &c.

we make use of Telescopes, yet our sight cannot receive such an Image or Idea of the Sun, which answers to its just magnitude, which is counted to be 160 times bigger than the Earth. From whence now comes this apprehension of the bigness of the Sun, which is far above that which we receive by our sense? If it be answered, that by the observation of the lessening of objects, according to the proportion of distance, the mind may come to understand how much bigger the Sun is than it seems, I grant it: but withal enquire how the Imagination comes to have those proportions and distances, which are meer respects, and can have no corporeal phantasms whereby to be represented to it. So that by this very way of ratiocination it is evident, that there is some Principle in Man beyond his Imagination, which corrects the

Errors

nous paroît être. Et quoy que nous nous servions de Telescopes, nôtre vüe ne recevra pourtant pas une telle image ou idée du Soleil, qui réponde justement à sa grandeur, que l'on dit être 160 fois plus grand que la terre. Or d'où vient cette apprehension de la grandeur du Soleil, qui est beaucoup au dessus de celle que nous recevons par nos Sens ? Si l'on me répond, que par l'observation de la diminution des objets, selon la proportion de distance, l'esprit peut bien entendre, combien le Soleil est plus grand qu'il ne paroît, je l'avoüe ; mais en même temps je demande comment l'imagination vient à avoir ces proportions & distances, qui sont des purs respects, & qui ne peuvent avoir de Phantômes corporels pour luy être representez. De sorte que par cette façon de raisonner, il est évident qu'il y a dans l'homme un principe qui est

104 Of the Immortality of, &c.

*Errors thereof; which Faculty being not corporeal, (as I have made it appear) ought consequently to be spiritual, and therefore Immortal.*

*Every body grants Man to be compounded of two parts essentially different, viz. of Body and Soul; and all Christians do believe the resurrection of our Bodies, as it is written in the Creed, and in several Chapters of the Holy Scripture. But now since there is no mention made of the resurrection of our Souls, and that it is certain they shall be united again to our Bodies in the day of Resurrection, it is a certain sign, that they never die.*

*These words, which Jesus Christ answered to the Thief, who was executed with him, and believed in him. This day shalt thou be with*



est au deffus de son imagination, & qui en corrige les erreurs ; laquelle faculté n'étant pas corporelle , ( ainsi que j'ay déjà fait voir cy-devant ) doit être conséquemment spirituelle, & par conséquent Immortelle.

Chacun convient que l'homme est composé de deux parties essentiellement différentes , sçavoir de Corps & d'Ame ; & tous les Chrétiens croient la resurrection des corps , ainsi qu'il est écrit dans le Symbole des Apôtres, & dans plusieurs chapitres de la Ste. Ecriture. Or puis qu'il n'y est point fait mention de la resurrection de nos ames, & qu'il est certain qu'elles se réuniront à nos corps au jour de la Resurrection , c'est une marque certaine qu'elles ne meurent jamais.

Ces poroles, que répondit Jesus Christ au Laron, qui fut executé avec luy, & qui crut en luy. *Aujourd'huy tu seras avec moy en Paradis ;*  
&

## 196 Of the Immortality of our Souls.

with me in Paradise; and what he said again concerning the Soul of Dives and that of Lazarus, that the former went into Hell, and that the latter, after it was separated from its body was immediately carried by the Angels into Abraham's Bosom, do clearly prove the Immortality of our Souls. And that which we read in the 12. Chapter of Ecclesiastes, then shall the Dust return to the Earth, as it was, and the Spirit shall return unto God, who gave it, takes all doubts away.

Fear not them, which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul: but rather fear him, which is able to destroy both Soul and Body in Hell, Mat. 10. 28. If they be not able to kill the Soul, then it is immortal, otherwise this admonition of our Lord Jesus Christ should be to no purpose. The Souls of Men, saith Dionysius chap. 4. de div. nom. have a substantial Life, which cannot be consumed. And St. Austin, de van. sec. saith, that when our Soul is separated from its Body, then it is immediately placed in Paradise for its good works, or cast into Hell because of its Sins.

F I N I S.

& ce qu'il dit encore de l'ame du Riche, & de celle du pauvre Lazare, que celle-là fut en Enfer, & que celle-cy après être séparée de son corps, fut incontinent portée par les Anges dans le Sein d'Abraham, prouvent clairement l'Immortalité de nos ames. Et ce que nous lisons dans le 12. Chapitre de l'Ecclesiaste, *que la Poudre retournera en Terre, comme elle étoit, & que l'Esprit retournera à Dieu, qui l'a donné,* ne nous laisse aucun lieu d'en douter.

*Ne craignez point ceux qui tuent le corps, & ne peuvent tuer l'ame : mais craignez plutôt celui qui peut détruire & le corps & l'ame dans la Gehenne, Mat. 10. 28.* S'ils ne peuvent pas tuer l'ame, donc elle est Immortelle, autrement cette admonition de nôtre Seigneur Jesus Christ ne serviroit de rien. *Les ames des hommes, dit S. Denis, c. 4. de div. nom. ont une vie substantielle qui ne se peut consumer.* Et S. Augustin, de van. séc. dit, *que quand nôtre ame est séparée de son corps, elle est incontinent placée dans le Paradis pour ses bonnes œuvres, ou jettée dans l'Enfer à cause de ses péchez.*

F I N.

101

2.02.000 2 1 19 13 15

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1

...and the ...

*[Faint, illegible text]*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1950-1951

1927

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific information required.

---

Brevis & accuratus  
 PHILOSOPHIÆ  
 C U R S U S.

**P**hilosophia, si nomen spectes, est nomen Græcum, quod nihil aliud sonat quàm Amor Sapientiæ. Si definitionem quæras, est rerum divinarum, & humanarum cognitio, quantam homo hîc in terris naturali lumine colligi sequi potest.

Unde derivatur hæc vox *Physica* ?

Ab ista voce græca φυσικῶν, quæ Naturam Significat.

Quid est Natura ?

Est vox homonyma, seu æquivoca, quæ res diversas significat. Nam sumitur 1<sup>o</sup>. pro Authore Naturæ, nempe Deo, in quo ab æterno reperiuntur omnium rerum Naturæ, quas *Plato* Idæas, & *Aristoteles* universalialia, vocat.

2<sup>o</sup>, Sumitur pro Ordine, quem Deus  
 A in

in hoc Mundo constituit; Sic dicimus alia advenire secundum Naturam, alia verò contra Naturam; id est, vel secundum vel contra ordinem hujus Mundi à Deo stabilitum.

3°. Natura sumitur pro Hominis temperamento; Sic homo, in quo Calor aut frigus dominatur, naturâ suâ vocatur aut calidus aut frigidus.

4°. Natura sumitur pro Habitu, Facultate, Inclinatione, vel naturali virtute: quo sensu dicimus Hominem esse naturâ suâ benignum, & rationalem.

5°. Natura sumitur pro Mundo; & hoc sensu per omnia quæ sunt in Natura, intelligimus cuncta quæ sunt in Mundo.

6°. Natura sumitur pro Materia & Forma, quæ sunt principia compositionis, & Causæ motus & quietis. Ac proinde quia Cœli, Elementa, & omnia alia corpora constant ex Materiâ & Formâ, idcirco dicimus Naturam Cœlorum, naturam ignis, naturam aquæ, naturam terræ, &c.

Quid est Physica?

Est Scientia rerum naturalium, quatenus naturalium.

Quare dicis *quatenus Naturalium*?

Ut

Ut distinguatur ab alijs scientijs, quæ quidem veriantur circa corpus naturale, sed non quatenus naturale; ut exempli gratiâ distinguatur à Medicina, quæ reverà versatur circa corpus naturale, sed quatenus sanabile.

Quodnam est Objectum Physicæ?

Alij asserunt esse corpus mobile ut mobile; alij verò dicunt esse corpus naturale quatenus naturale. Hanc ego ultimam opinionem sustineo, quia mobile est qualitas, quæ necessario sequitur esse naturale. Corpus igitur dicitur mobile, quia est naturale: & quamvis non possit esse naturale, quin simul sit mobile, tamen naturale præcedit ut causa; & mobile sequitur ut effectus.

Est ne Physica strictè loquendo Scientia?

Notandum est Scientiam dividi in actualem & habitualem. Actualem Scientiam voco particularem cognitionem alicujus rei per propriam causam; ut quando novi Eclipsim Lunæ nihil aliud esse quàm interpositionem terræ inter Solem & Lunam. Et Scientiam habitualement appellō collectionem multarum actualium Scientiarum, quæ circa idem objectum versantur. His positis dico Physicam esse veram Scientiam

habitualement, quippe quæ constat ex multis actualibus scientijs circa idem objectum versantibus, nempe corpus naturale

Objicies. Scientia versatur circa res finitas; atqui res naturales sunt infinitæ,

Ergo non datur Scientia de rebus naturalibus, & consequenter non datur *Phyfica*.

R. Quamvis res naturales vocentur infinitæ, quippe quæ numerari non possunt; quis enim stellas Cœlorum, arborum folia, arenam Maris, & alia quæ sunt in hoc Mundo numerare potest? Reverâ tamen sunt finitæ, tum quia illis aliquid semper addere possumus, tum quia Deus illarum numerum perfectè novit.

Quomodo dividitur Corpus?

Corpus est vox homonyma; sumitur enim aliquando pro quantitate, seu pro tribus dimensionibus corporis mathematici, nempe longitudine, latitudine, & profunditate; sicque vocatur corpus mathematicum. Aliquando pro aliqua substantia corporea, nempe homine, arbore, Equo; & sic nominatur corpus physicum, seu naturale. Aliquando etiam sumitur pro re aliqua arte facta, qualis est domus; & ob hanc causam appellatur corpus artificiale. Quo-



Quomodo dividitur corpus naturale?  
In simplex, & mixtum, seu compo-  
situm.

Quid est corpus simplex?

Est illud, quod non constat ex qua-  
tuor Elementis.

Quid est corpus mixtum?

Est illud, in quo quatuor Elemento-  
rum mixtio reperitur.

Quænam sunt corpora simplicia?

Quatuor Elementa, videlicet, Terra,  
Aqua, Aer, Ignis. Et Stellæ, ut quidam  
volunt Philosophi.

Quænam sunt corpora mixta?

Mixta sunt vel perfecta, vel imper-  
fecta. Perfecta, alia sunt inanimata, ut  
lapides; alia sunt animata, ut Plantæ;  
alia sensibilia, ut Canes; alia rationa-  
lia, ut Homo. Imperfecta, ut Monstra,  
& Meteora.

Quodnam est discrimen inter corpus  
naturale & artificiale?

Forma corporum artificialium est ac-  
cidentalis, & potius dicitur figura quàm  
forma; sed econtra forma corporum  
naturalium est essentialis, dat esse rei &  
illam distinguit ab alijs. 2<sup>o</sup> Corpora  
naturalia ex se ipsis habent principium  
motus, non verò artificialia quatenus

artificialia. Statua exempli gratiâ non ideo cadit in terram, quia est statua, sed quia est aut Lapis, aut lignum, aut aliqua alia materia gravis, cujus natura semper deorsum tendit. 3°. Causa efficiens corporum naturalium producit sui simile, v. g. homo producit hominem, & equus alium equum: Sed id non reperitur in causa corporum artificialium; quamvis enim homo arte multos nobiles effectus producere possit, artificialiter tamen non potest producere sui simile.

Quænam sunt Principia rerum naturalium?

Alij voluerunt esse Terram, quam idcirco uxorem Cœli vocabant: quia mediantibus Cœlorum influentijs Terra omnia producit.

Alij dicebant esse Lumen & Tenebras, quia ex illis, quasi ex Patre & Matre, omnia produci affirmabant.

*Epicurus & Democritus* asseruerunt Atomos esse principia rerum omnium naturalium; intelligentes per istas atomos quædam corpora invilibilia, indivisibilia, & tamen corporea, quorum diversa mixtio corporum varietatem formabat.

*Socrates & Plato* crediderunt Ideas, quæ

quæ sunt in Deo, esse rerum omnium principia ; putant enim Deum esse similem artifici humano, qui Idæam operis prius in mente concipit, quàm illud conficiat.

Equidem arbitror esse Materiam & Formam ; quia ex istis duobus principijs constant omnia corpora naturalia.

Quænam conditiones requiruntur ad rerum naturalium principia ?

Non debent esse facta ab alijs ; alioquin non essent prima principia. 2<sup>o</sup>. Non debent esse à se invicem, quod de illorum natura seu essentia intelligendum est. Quamvis enim Forma educatur è materia, ex ea tamen naturam suam non magis recipit, quàm è privatione formæ præcedentis.

Proba quòd in generatione rerum naturalium sint tantum duo principia, videlicet Materia & Forma.

In generatione verbi gratiâ pulli reperitur subjectum, nempe ovum, quod mutari debet, idque vocatur materia ; & reperitur pullus, in quem ovum mutatum est, & id vocatur Forma. Nihilominus privatio formæ ovi est necessaria sic, ut absque illa non possit introduci forma pulli. Hinc patet privationem

nem formæ præcedentis esse conditionem in generatione requisitam, sed non principium; quia omne principium debet esse reale: quoniam autem privatio non est realis, idcirco non potest esse verum compositionis principium.

Quomodo dividitur Materia?

In materiam in qua, quæ dicitur subiectum formæ & accidentium. Ex. gratiâ Corpus humanum est subiectum animæ rationalis, & aliorum accidentium, quæ in corpore humano reperiuntur.

2º. In materiam ex qua aliquid factum est; lignum ex. gratiâ est materia, ex qua fit cathedra; Ferrum est materia, ex qua fit ensis; & marmor est materia, ex qua fit statua.

3º. In materiam circa quam Agens operatur; lignum v. g. est materia, circa quam ignis agit; & corpus naturale est materia, circa quam meditatatur Philosophus.

4º. Materia dividitur in mediatam seu remotam; & in immediatam seu proximam. Ex. gratiâ femina, ex quibus plantæ constant, sunt materia proxima seu immediata; & quatuor Elementa, videlicet Ignis, Aer, Aqua & Terra, sunt materia mediata seu remota.

Quid

Quid est materia ?

Est primum subjectum ex quo omnia fiunt ex se principaliter, & non mediante alio; & est ultimum, in quod omnia resolvuntur.

Expone mihi hanc definitionem ?

Voco materiam subjectum, quia est omnium formarum receptaculum; & dicitur primum, quia differt à forma, quæ est secundum principium rerum naturalium. 2°. Quando dico *Ex se principaliter, & non mediante alio*, tunc declaro esse principium, quod à nulla causa naturali dependet. 3°. Cùm dico eam esse *ultimum subjectum, in quod omnia resolvuntur*, tum declaro quòd, sicut materia est primum subjectum in compositione, sic ea est ultimum in destructione.

Nota quòd sicut ex eadem cera homo multas formare potest figuras; sic ex eadem materia natura diversas educere potest formas.

Quid est Forma ?

Est quod dat esse rei, & illam distinguit ab alijs. Et, *ut ait Aristoteles*, est secundum principium compositionis habens vim actus, & non potentiae.

Quare sic illam definis ?

Ut distinguatur à materia, quæ primum

mum est principium corporum naturalium, vim habens potentiae, & non actus.

Quid est Privatio ?

Est absentia, seu amissio formæ, quæ materiæ priùs inerat; & cui, cùm amittitur, tum alia semper succedit.

Quid est causa ?

Est id, per quod res aliqua produci-  
tur.

Quotuplex datur causa ?

Quadruplex; Efficiens, Materialis, Formalis & Finalis; quia quatuor tantum de corpore naturali fieri possunt quæstiones, quæ ad quatuor supradictas causas referuntur.

Fac ut hoc elucidetur aliquo exemplo. Quando petis à me, quis hanc statuem in tuo horto positam elaboravit, tunc causam efficientem declaras. Cùm postulas ex qua materia sit facta, tum causam denotas materiale. Quando quæris cui sit similis, tunc causam formalem ostendis; & cùm inquiris propter quem finem sit facta, tum finalem causam manifestas.

Nota in rebus artificialibus dari causam exemplarem, sed quæ ad formalem rectè referri potest.

An

An potest una & eadem causa contrarios producere effectus?

Ita; Sol enim indurat lutum, & molificat Ceram.

Quomodo dividitur causa?

In proximan & remotam; in simplicem & compositam; in actualem, & potentialem; in partialem, & totalem; in instrumentalem & principalem; in finitam, & infinitam, ut in Ethicis videre est.

Quid est Fortuna?

Est accidentalis causa, quæ rarò reperitur in executione humanarum actionum, quæ fiunt cum electione, & libertate propter aliquem finem.

Quid est fortuitus Casus?

Est accidentalis causa rerum, quæ rarò eveniunt absque ulla præcedenti deliberatione.

Fac ut hoc elucescat aliquo familiari exemplo.

Miles, armis ditescere cupiens, in bellum proficiscitur, & magnum Thesaurum, quem non quærebat, invenit; hæc inventio Thesauri vocatur Fortuna. Paulò post cùm idem miles transfiret per plateas civitatis, lapis ab alto decidens illum occidit; id vocatur casus fortuitus,

tus, quia hæc accidentalis causa cum naturali reperitur absque ulla humana deliberatione. Est enim naturale lapidi, ut pote corpori gravi, tendere deorsum.

*Quid est Fatum ?*

Est executio Providentiæ Divinæ in omnibus rebus, quæ accidunt in hoc Mundo. Quamobrem cuicumque rei, quæ accidit nobis, planè submittere debemus, ut procedenti à voluntate Divina, quæ de omnibus rebus, ut libet, disponit.

Nonne possumus dicere Fatum, seu quidquid nobis evenit in hoc Mundo, esse effectum Astrorum & Syderum.

Ante Sciendum est dari res necessarias, liberas & contingentes, quàm huic quæstioni respondeam. Necessaria dicuntur illa, quæ uno tantummodo evenire possunt, ut ignem calefacere necessarium est. Libera vocantur ea, quæ sunt in nostra potestate, ut loqui & non loqui nobis liberum est. Et contingentia nominantur illa, quæ possunt evenire & non evenire; ut evenire potest & non evenire quòd Turca superet Germanos. His positis.

Dico quæstionem non esse de necessarijs, quippe quæ semper eodem modo eveniunt;



eveniunt; sed de liberis tantum & contingentibus. Itaque dico quòd, licet sydera magnam per se habeant influentiam supra corpora nostra, & per accidens super animas nostras, quatenus in operationibus earum à dispositione corporum nostrorum dependent; illas tamen neutiquam necessitant, ut ostendam in suo loco. Isti ergo non bene loquuntur qui, quicquid nobis accidit, illud syderibus attribuunt; quippe cum omnia sint Divinæ Providentiæ tribuenda.

Quomodo Fatum vocabant Pagani?

Parcas, quia nemini parcunt.

Quot sunt Parcæ?

Tres, Lachesis, Cloto & Atropos.

Quare sic illas vocabant Pagani?

Quia dicebant quòd, sicut est fors nostra, sic neta est vita nostra, & tandem absque ulla remissione scissa.

Quid est Natura?

Est, ut ait *Aristoteles*, principium motus & quietis, rei, ubi est per se, & non per accidens.

Quid intelligis per Naturam?

Intelligo, ut jam initio hujusce tractatus demonstravi, Materiam & Formam, quæ sunt causæ cur res moveantur & quiescant.

B

Quid

Quid intelligis per motum?

Non solum intelligo mutationem rei ex uno loco ad alium, sed etiam mutationem in Substantia, quæ dicitur generatio, aut corruptio; mutationem in quantitate, quæ vocatur accretio, aut diminutio; & mutationem in Qualitate, quæ Alteratio nuncupatur.

Quare dicis *Principium motus & quietis, rei ubi est?*

Quia causa, quæ non est in mobili, hoc est in corpore, quod movetur, neque est illius natura, neque propria causa sui motus, sed extranea.

*Obji.* Si Natura esset principium motus & quietis, inde sequeretur Artes fore naturam, quippe quæ sunt principia & causæ motuum quarundam rerum. Ex gratiâ Ars conficiendi Horologia esset Natura, ut pote principium motus qui in Horologijs reperitur; & sic Ars saltandi foret Natura, quia est principium motus saltantis.

*Respondeo.* Ars conficiendi Horologia, quæ videtur esse eorum motuum causa, non est illorum vera & propria causa, sed regula tantum; propria enim & vera causa motuum in Horologijs, sunt pondera, quæ, quia descendunt, idcirco propter

propter gravitatem movent rotas, quarum motus est duntaxat artificialis. Idem dicere debemus de aliquo saltante; Principium naturale motus corporis sui, est corpus ejus; Ars solummodo docet eum, quid in motu observare debeat.

*Obji.* 2° Si natura foret causa motus & quietis rerum naturalium, quælibet res naturalis & quiescere, & moveri deberet; atqui hoc falsum videtur; Terra enim, v. g. Videtur esse in perpetua quiete, Cœli autem in continuo motu. Ergo hæc definitio Naturæ non est bona, quippe quæ cuilibet corpori naturali non conveniens.

*R.* Cùm dicitur Naturam esse principium motus & quietis, idem est ac si diceretur vel motus vel quietis; ac proinde si Terra solummodò quiescat, & Cœli tantum moveantur, & animalia utrumque habeant, motum scilicet & quietem, hoc procedit à Natura, quæ nihil est aliud quàm unio Materiæ cum forma.

*R.* 2° Quòd, quia sunt quatuor motuum genera, non necesse est ut quodlibet corpus naturale actualiter recipiat hos prædictos motus, unus sufficit ei, ut mobile dicatur.

Quisnam motus actualiter convenit Terræ & Cœlis? B 2 Alte-

Alterationis motus convenit Terræ, nam Terra sæpe recipit diversas qualitates, putà calorem & frigus; siccitatem, & humiditatem cum varijs coloribus. Cœli verò, præter quam quòd nunc Circulationis motum habeant, juxta Prophetam aliquando mutabuntur; alterationem enim patientur, & longe pulchriores quàm nunc sunt apparebunt.

Quid est motus?

Est actio, quæ procedens ab agente recipitur in patiente, quatenus est patientis. Ex. gratiâ actio, per quam ovum mutatur in pullum, est actio formæ quæ recipitur in materia; Forma est agens, materia est patientis.

Quodnam est discrimen inter actionem & passionem?

Nullum aliud nisi quòd quatenus motus procedit ab agente, tunc actio vocatur; & quatenus recipitur in subjecto patiente, tum passio nominatur. Sed reverà est una & eadem res, quæ non differt nisi sub diverso respectu; ut via, quæ ducit à Londino ad Oxonium, est eadem atque illa quæ ducit ab Oxonio ad Londinum.

In quot cathégorijs reperitur motus?

In quatuor, nempe in substantia, in  
quan-

quantitate, in qualitate, & in loco.

Quotuplex reperitur motus in substantia?

Duplex; generatio & corruptio.

Quid est Generatio?

Est motus à non esse ad esse.

Quid est Corruptio?

Est motus ab esse ad non esse. Ex. Gratiâ, quando, ut jam dixi, ex Ovo fit pullus, en generatio. Et quando pullus moriens desinit esse animal, en corruptio.

Nota quòd Generatio unius sit semper Corruptio alterius; & vicissim quòd corruptio unius sit generatio alterius.

Quotuplex datur motus in quantitate?

Duplex; Accretio & diminutio?

Quid est Accretio & quid diminutio?

Accretio est motus à minori quantitate ad maiorem; & diminutio contra est motus à maiori quantitate ad minorem.

Quot sunt motus in qualitate?

Duo sunt contrarij, qui vocantur motus alterationis.

Quid est alteratio?

Est motus ab una qualitate ad aliam; ut cum aliquis homo è virtuoso fit virtuosus;

tiosus; aut econtra è vitioso fit virtuosus.

Quotuplices inveniuntur motus in loco, sive in cathegoria, *ubi*, quæ dicitur Translatio.

Duo, ut verbi gratiâ, cùm aliquod corpus transit ab uno loco ad alium, putâ ab Oriente ad Occidentem; à Meridie ad Septentrionem; aut econtra.

Quomodo vocantur termini motus?

Alter vocatur terminus *à quo*, & alter terminus *ad quem*. Locus, exempli causâ, à quo discedimus vocatur terminus à quo; & ille, ad quem tendimus, nominatur terminus ad quem.

*Obicies.* Motus in Qualitate non est semper ab uno contrario ad aliud. Ex. gratiâ, motus tepiditatis ad calorem; ergo motus in qualitate non invenitur semper inter duo contraria.

R. Duo dantur contraria, immediata scilicet & mediata. Immediata, ut ægritudo, & sanitas; mediata, ut tepiditas & frigus. Cùm autem motus in qualitate dicitur esse inter duo contraria, id intelligitur de contrarijs sive immediatis sive mediatis.

Quot res requiruntur in motu?

Quinque, nempe motor, mobile, duo termini

termini motus, & tempus, quo durante fit motus. Exempli causâ, in aqua calefacta motor est Ignis; Aqua est mobile; Terminus, extremitas, sive contrarium à quo incipit calor, est frigus; & alter terminus, sive contrarium, in quo desinit, est calor; & tempus, quo durante calefcit aqua est sesqui hora, plus vel minus. Corpus enim frigidum, fieri non potest calidum in instanti; nec parvum, magnum; nec ab uno loco ad alium transire absque aliquo temporis spatio. Id etiam in generatione observari potest, licet contrarium affirmet aliqui Philosophi, nam experientia patet v. g. in generatione Pulli, quòd, cùm gradatim ovum formam suam amittit, gradatim etiam introducitur forma Pulli.

Quando unum contrarium introducit in aliquod subjectum per expulsiōnem alterius contrarij, ex. Gratiâ, cùm calor ignis introducitur in aquam, ita ut frigus expellatur ab ea, utrum contrarium præcedit?

R. Quòd quemadmodum clavus ligneus expellitur ab alio; sic cùm unum contrarium introducitur in aliquod subjectum, tum aliud ab eo expellitur.

Conci-

Concipere tamen debemus, quòd agens præcedat patientem, ac proinde concipere debemus priùs calorem introduci, quàm frigus expellatur.

Quodnam est discrimen inter motum naturalem & violentum?

Motus naturalis præcedit à naturali principio corporis, cuius est motus; ut cùm ignis sursum ascendit, aut lapis descendit deorsum. Violentus verò est contrarius corpori, & reperitur in alio; ut cùm lapis projicitur sursum.

Ex motu naturali & violento uter est celerrimus?

Motus naturalis semper est celerior in fine quàm in principio; quia cùm mobile propius accedat ad centrum, id circo medium minus ei resistit. Econtra motus violentus est celerior in initio quàm in fine, quia virtus motrix semper magis ac magis debilitatur. Verumtamen in rebus vibratis, ut sunt sagittæ, motus est celerior in medio, quàm vel in principio, vel in fine, ut experintiâ patet: In rebus enim vibratis virtus motrix dilatatur in iusto & proportionato intervallo, quale est medium; restringitur in initio, ac proinde non eundem habet effectum; in fine autem debilitatur propter loci distantiam. Quo-



Quomodo fit accretio corporum?

Antequam respondeam, observare debemus corpus hominis constare partibus homogeneis, & heterogeneis. Partes ossis dicuntur homogeneæ, quia sunt eiusdem naturæ; partes autem capitis, brachij, aut pedis dicuntur heterogeneæ, quia diversam habent naturam; in capite enim in brachio & in pede reperiuntur sanguis, cutis, nervi, qui differentis sunt naturæ; his positis.

Dico accretionem partium homogenearum & simul heterogenearum corporis humani fieri mediante alimento, quod corpus nostrum sumit ad vitam sustentandam.

Quomodo id fit, ostende quæso.

Dum ad huc juvene est corpus, propter naturalem calorem in eo tunc ebullientem cibos frequenter appetit; & quia majorem nutritionem assumit quàm necesse est, ad humidum radicale conservandum, idcirco quod superest inservit accretioni omnium partium corporis; Sed cum iustam acquisivit naturalem quantitatem, tum id, quod sumit, alimenti inservit humido radicali conservando. Quod enim est oleum lampadi, ipsum est corpori nostro humidum

midum radicale : Si verò plus alimentum sumat quàm coquere potest, nocet ei cibus, tunc pinguescere potest, sed non accrescere; Senescente autem corpore, alimentum non potest tantùm humidi radicalis reparare, quantum deperditur, quia calor naturalis debilitatur : Sicque sensim debilitato corpore, & cessante humido radicali, mors postea sequitur. Quod dico de corpore humano, idem dici debet de cœteris corporibus, quæ incrementum suscipiunt, ut sunt Plantæ, & animalia omnia.

Quomodo fit concoctio alimenti ?

Cibus adductus per manum in os nostrum, ibi dentibus teritur, si durus; si verò liquidus, sorbetur; postquam autem in stomachum descendit, ibi per calorem naturalem, sicut caro in olla per ignem, coquitur : Deinde mutatus in chylum, per venas mezaraicas in venam portam nomine effluit, ubi separatus, & purgatus à fœcali materia, alijs que excrementis corporis ad jecur transit, ubi in sanguinem permutatur. Jecur autem retinens quod ei necesse est, cœtera distribuit singulis corporis partibus, ibique muratur in subtilissimum liquorem, qui vertitur in eandem partis, cui con-

conjungitur, naturam; idque mediantibus poris, atque ita facile ac videmus sudorem effluere ex iisdem poris, fitque caro cum carne, os cum ossibus, nervus cum nervis, & sic de cœteris partibus.

Quid est Locus?

Est superficies corporis aliud corpus ambientis. Ex. causâ, Extremitas Aeris tangentis corpus meum est propriè locus corporis mei; & illa extremitas seu superficies aquæ Rupem tangentis est propriè locus rupis. Itaque licet corpus locum non mutet, locus tamen ejus mutare potest, ut exemplo alicujus domus videre est: Licet enim domus sit immobilis, Aer tamen domum circundans tam sæpe mutatur quam pellitur à vento.

An Cœli, continuò volventes super capita nostra, mutant locum?

Locum non mutant, quippe qui semper servant eundem circulum. Verumtamen si de partibus Cœlorum loqui intendas, dico eas mutare locum, pars enim Cœlorum aliquando in Oriente, & aliquando in Occidente apparet.

An altissima Cœlorum superficies aliqua alterius corporis superficie continetur?

Nequaquam; si namque aliqua alterius

rius corporis superficie contineretur, daretur progressus ad infinitum; quæri enim posset, utrum hæc superficies aliqua altera superficie contineatur, & sic usque ad infinitum, quod est absurdum.

Utrum duo corpora naturaliter possint esse in eodem loco, eodem tempore?

Nullo modo, quia superficies Aeris ambientis, v. g. Domum tuam, non potest eodem tempore ambire meam, hoc repugnat sensibus & rationi.

*Obji.* Ciathus cineribus plenus multum aquæ recipere potest; & idem ciathus plenus aquæ, quadrantes multos recipere potest; ergo duo corpora possunt esse naturaliter, eodem tempore in eodem loco.

*R.* Quando Ciathus cineribus plenus multum aquæ recipit, id procedit tum quia cineres magnam aquæ impositæ partem evaporant; tum quia cum sint spungiosæ alteram partem aquæ in foraminibus retinent. Quoad quadrantes, quos recipit Ciathus aquâ plenus, dico eos non esse in eodem loco, turgescit enim aqua, dum imponuntur quadrantes, donec, propter nimiam quadrantium quantitatem, effundatur.

Utrum

Utrum corpus possit esse in diversis locis uno & eodem tempore?

Id fieri non potest, & cum eadem repugnantia, atque duo corpora possunt esse in eodem loco, uno & eodem tempore. Nihilominus qui Ecclesiæ Romanæ fidem profitentur, ij hanc doctrinam tenent, ut patet in illorum Transsubstantiatione, ubi fateri coguntur, Corpus Christi esse simul & eodem tempore in Cœlo, in Terra & in singulis partibus Hostiæ Consecratæ.

Quot modis res in loco dici potest?

Quinque modis. 1° Per se, sicut quodlibet Corpus naturale est per se in aliquo loco. 2° Ob aliquam ex suis partibus, quemadmodum arbor dicitur esse in terra propter suas radices. 3° Mediante re aliqua, cui vel adhæret, vel in qua includitur, ut color dicitur esse in aliquo loco, quia adhæret corpori, & Nauclera dicitur esse in Mari, quia includitur in Navi super Mare naviganti. 4° Circumscriptivè quando scilicet limitatur, & mensuratur per superficiem corporis illam continentis, ut Vinum in dolio. 5° Definitivè, quando, ab aliquo loco nec limitari, nec mensurari potest, ut sunt Angeli, alij que Spiritus; ipsi enim,  
C quia

copore carent, idcirco nec habent partes, nec quantitatem, ac proinde à nullo loco neque limitari neque mensurari possunt.

*Obji.* Deus est Spiritus, ergo est in aliquo loco definitivè.

*R.* Quamvis Deus sit Spiritus, non tamen est in aliquo loco definitivè, quia est infinitus: esse autem in aliquo loco definitivè, id solummodò spectat ad Spiritus finitos.

*Obji.* 2<sup>o</sup> Sacrae Scripturae dicunt Deum esse particulariter in Cœlis; cum enim illum supplices Oramus, tum dicere solemus, *Pater Noster qui es in Cœlis*; ergo est definitivè in aliquo loco.

*R.* Quamvis Sacrae Scripturae dicant Deum esse particulariter in Cœlis, non inde sequitur eum non esse ubique, sed id duntaxat dicitur ad nobis declarandum, quòd illic potissimum gloriam suam manifestat.

Quid est vacuum?

Est spatium omni corpore vacuum, sed capax recipiendi.

An datur vacuum in Natura?

Minimè; cum enim Pulchritudo universi consistat in harmonia, seu conjunctione corporum inter se, hæc harmonia

monia cessaret, si daretur vacuum.

Præterea, quandoquidem vacuum sumitur pro spatio, ubi nulla reperitur substantia, certum est nullum dari tale spatium in universo; cum enim quodlibet spatium sit extensum, sequitur illud esse plenum aliquâ substantiâ, ac proinde non datur vacuum. Idque patet experientiâ, nam natura, ut vacuum impediat, cogit corpora moveri contra naturam.

*Obji.* Cum non datur Vinum in lagenâ, aut pecunia in crumena, tum dicuntur esse vacuæ; ergo datur vacuum.

R. Licet Lagenâ dicatur esse vacua vino, & crumena pecuniâ, sunt tamen Aere plena.

*Obji.* 2<sup>o</sup> Si omnia sint plena, nec datur vacuum in Natura, nullum Corpus poterit moveri ab uno loco ad alium; si enim omnia sunt plena, non erit illi locus, ergo vacuum dari debet.

R. Hoc non impedit quominus corpus moveatur ab uno loco ad alium; quædam enim corpora cedunt quibusdam corporibus; Aer. v.g. Aqua, Ignis, quando transimus, dant locum nostris corporibus, ut pote durioribus. Fateor tamen nullum naturalem dari motum

inter corpora dura & solida, putà inter ferrum & lapidem, nam ferrum lapidi resistit, & vicissim lapis ferro. Et, si quando detur motus inter illa, vel est violentus, vel artificialis, vel supernaturalis.

*Obji.* 3<sup>o</sup> Supposito quòd aliquis homo sit super superficie altissimi Cœli; aut potest extendere brachium suum, aut non potest : Si potest extendere brachium, ergo datur aliquod spatium vacuum; quòd si non potest, ergo impeditur aliquo corpore solido resistente. Si dicas dari aliquod corpus resistens, eandem quæstionem faciam usque ad infinitum, quod certè absurdum est.

*R.* Hoc rationaliter supponi non potest; nihil enim altissimo Cœlo superaddi nequit; alioquin admittendus esset progressus in infinitum, prætereà hæc objectio non est de vacuo in natura, sed extra naturam.

*Obji.* 4<sup>o</sup> Deus creavit Mundum in multis diebus, ergo erat vacuum in natura, aliter alijs corporibus, quæ postea creata fuerunt, locum dare non potuisset.

*R.* Non esse verum, quòd Deus Mundum creaverit in multis diebus, illum enim



enim creavit in instanti, ut clarè ostendamus, cùm de creatione mentionem faciam. Et licet Mundum creasset in multis diebus, non inde sequeretur fuisse vacuum, quia cùm Deus rem creavit, tum & simul spatium illius creavit.

Quid est Infinitum ?

Est id, quod limitari non potest, quod neque initium, neque finem habet, & cui nihil addi nequit.

Quot modis accipitur Infinitum ?

Sex modis. In corpore, in multitudine, in duratione, in actu, in potentia & in essentia.

An datur Infinitum in corpore ?

Non datur ; quia vel partes illius essent finitæ, vel infinitæ ; finitas dicere non potes, quia ex partibus finitis nil nisi finitum resultare potest : Infinitas etiam dicere non potes, inde namque sequeretur partes fore æque magnas atque totum. Ergo non datur corpus infinitum.

An datur Infinitum in multitudine ?

Minimè ; quia nullus datur numerus, quin ei semper numerum addere possimus.

*Obji.* Quodlibet corpus finitum limitatur aliquo alio corpore, eoque continetur,

netur. Ergo pofito uno corpore fequitur aliud corpus continens, & limitans, & fic ufque ad infinitum, ergo datur Infinitum in multitudine.

Rx. Quòd, quemadmodum omnes pelles cœpis limitantur à prima, quæ à nulla alia limitatur, fic cùm pervenimus ad altiffimum Cœlum, tum nihil eft ampliùs quod limitet illud, fed à fe ipfo limitatur.

An datur Infinitum in duratione, feu in tempore?

Non datur; quia cùm tempus nihil fit aliud quàm mefura durationis rerum caducarum, & cùm res caducae inceperint à creatione Mundi, fequitur quòd tempus feu duratio inceperit cum illis, ac proinde quod non detur Infinitum in duratione, feu tempore.

An datur Infinitum in Potentia?

Si per potentiam intelligas, quòd Deus producere poffit infinitum actualiter infinitum, refpondeo negativè; quia fi poffet producere unum, Deus ipfe defineret effe infinitus, deeffet enim in eo quod fupponitur effe in alio.

*Obji.* Si Deus nequit producere infinitum, ergo non eft omnipotens; atqui Deus eft omnipotens; Ergo producere potest infinitum.

Rx. Quam-

R<sup>x</sup>. Quamvis Deus non possit producere infinitum, inde non sequitur eum non esse omnipotentem : Defectus namque istius potentiae non procedit à Deo, sed à creatura, quæ infinita esse non potest.

*Obji.* 2<sup>o</sup> Effectus debent causis suis respondere, Ergo Deus producere potest effectus infinitos, quippe qui infinitus.

R<sup>x</sup>. Id esse commune in Creaturis, sed id esse non potest in Creatore; alioquin Creatura, quæ producitur in tempore, foret æterna, imo esset Deus; quod admitti non potest, nam pluralitas Deorum est contradictoria.

An datur Infinitum in actu, & in Essentia?

Ita, nempe Deus, & ipse solus.

Proba dari Deum?

Datur Mundus, ergo datur Deus. Vel enim Mundus est à se ipso, vel ab alio. Si dicas esse à se ipso, tunc illum esse Deum asseris; quod enim est à se ipso, est ille Deus, quem quærimus. Si dixeris esse ab alio, quæro utrum ille alius sit à se ipso, vel ab alio, & sic ad Infinitum, quod cuique patet esse absurdum. Ad unam ergo causam devenire debemus, à qua sint omnia, & quæ sit à se ipsa

ipsa, quam *Causam Deum* esse dicimus.

Dicere namque quòd hæc pulchra structura, harmonia, & constans ordo Solis, Stellarum, Cœlorum, & aliarum rerum, quæ videntur in hoc Mundo; quòd, inquam, hæc omnia casu & fortuitò sint facta, pari modo dicere possem, cum librum eleganter compositum video, eum esse casu, & fortuitò factum, & non ab homine intelligente, qui hoc & illo modo varias litteras disposuit. Cum ergo nemo, nisi stultus, id de libro asserere debet, sic nemo sapiens hanc harmoniam Mundi, & constantem Solis, Stellarum, Cœlorumque ordinem casu, & fortuitò accidisse dicet. *Causam* igitur Mundo attribuere cogetur, & hanc causam *Deum* esse affirmamus.

Quid est *Tempus*?

*Aegyptij* depinxerunt illud sub figura Serpentis caudam in gutture occultantis.

*Aristoteles* vocat illud mensuram motus & quietis rerum naturalium, Ex. Gratiâ, si unam horam insumo in Sacra Scripturæ lectione, hæc actio lectionis mensuratur à tempore in hac lectione insumpto.

Quo-

Quomodo dividitur Tempus ?

In præteritum, præsens, & futurum. Præteritum non est amplius; Futuro nundum fruimur, sed solo præsentī, quod nihil est aliud quàm instans, seu unio præteriti cum futuro, ut fusiùs videri potest in Logica p. 50.

Quæ res dicuntur esse in tempore ?

Corruptibiles tantùm. Deus itaque dici non potest in tempore, quia cùm nec initium, nec finem habeat, à tempore, quod & initium habuit, & finem habiturum est, mensurari non potest. Angeli etiam, & Anima Hominis non possunt dici in tempore, quia licet initium habeant, finem tamen non habebunt; sicque mensurantur ab ævo. Idem etiam erit de corporibus nostris post resurrectionem, ut passim Sacræ Scripturæ docent. Æternitas igitur ad Deum spectat; perpetuitas ad Angelos, ad Animam Hominis, & ad Corpus ejus post Resurrectionem; & Tempus ad cætera corpora corruptibilia.

Quid significat hæc vox *Mundus* ?

Ornamentum; Mundus enim est ita pucher, & perfectus in omnibus partibus suis, ut nihil ei addi possit; cùm enim res aliqua crescit, tunc eodem tempore

tempore alia diminuitur ; & cùm res aliqua generatur, tunc alia corrumpitur, & sic vicissim.

Quot dantur Mundi ?

Quinque, videlicet Mundus Archetypus, Angelicus, Elementaris, magnus Mundus, & parvus Mundus.

Quid est Mundus Archetypus ?

Est intellectus Divinus, in quo formæ omnium creaturarum eminenter inveniuntur, hoc est, modo multò excellentiori quàm in alijs mundis reperiuntur.

Quid est Mundus Angelicus ?

Sunt ipsi Angeli, aliique beati Spiritus.

Quid est Mundus Elementaris ?

Sunt ipsa Elementa, Ignis, Aer, Aqua Terra.

Quid est Mundus magnus ?

Est omnium creaturarum aggregatio. Parvus autem Mundus est Homo, qui sic vocatur, quia est compendium omnium aliorum Mundorum, idcirco à Græcis vocatur μικροκομος.

Fac ut intelligam hominem esse compendium omnium aliorum Mundorum ?

Similis est Mundo Archetypo, nempe Deo, quia creatus est ad imaginem, & simi-

similitudinem ejus. Similis est Mundo Angelico, quia, ut Angelus, intellectualem facultatem habet. Similis est mundo Elementari, quia constat ex quatuor Elementis. Et similis est magno Mundo, quia præcipuæ illius partes in eo reperiuntur. Caput ejus primum mobile representat; Sicut enim primum mobile movet Sphæras omnes Cœlestes, sic caput hominis movet omnes sensus sive externos sive internos. Cor ejus Solem representat; nam quemadmodum Sol existens in medio septem Planetarum, eas omnes illuminat, aliaque inferiora corpora ad vitam recipiendam disposita vivificat; Sic cor, existens in medio hominis corpore, vitam partibus ejus impertit. Oculi sydera representant, nec non humores, Influencias Planetarum. Vitam habet cum Plantis; cum Bestiis sensum; & quia constat ex quatuor Elementis, idcirco simpatizat cum omnibus mixtis.

Utrum magnus Mundus creatus fuerit ex aliqua materia præcedenti?

Fides nos docet Mundum factum fuisse ex nihilo, ut in Genesi legi potest; idque ratio demonstrat; nam si factus fuisset à materia præexistente, quæro utrum

utrùm hæc præexiftens materia facta fuerit, & fic ad Infinitum. Quod cùm fit absurdum, ex nihilo fuiſſe factum, atque adèò opus eſſe Dei concludere debemus ; Ille enim Solus aliquid ex nihilo facere pòteſt.

Utrum Mundus in multis diebus, vel in instanti creatus fuerit ?

In Instanti creatus eſt ; alioquin imperfecta fuiſſet operatio Divina, utpote per partes, & per Succeſſionem facta ; Sicque vacuum videretur fuiſſe in natura, ſi ſucceſſivè cœtera corpora creaffet.

*Obji.* Sacra Scriptura aſſerit Deum inſumpſiſſe ſex dies, cùm Cœlos, Terram & omnia quæ in eis ſunt, creaverit ; ergo Mundum non creavit in instanti.

*R.* Quòd Moyſes hanc dierum diſtinctionem ſolummodò fecerit, ut ſtupiditati populi Judaïci ſeipſum conformaret, ut videri poteſt his verbis, *in hoc die, quo Deus fecit Cælum & Terram, & gramina Campi, &c.* Ubi videtis Moyſem ad unum diem, & ad idem tempus referre id, quod diſtinxerat in multis diebus. Prætereà cùm certum ſit nullum diem fuiſſe ante Solis creationem, & cùm etiam ſit certum Solem fuiſſe creatum quarto die, quomodo aſſerere poſſumus



mus diem extitisse ante istum quartum diem.

An Mundus fieri poterat perfectior quàm nunc apparet ?

Mundus considerari potest sive in suis accidentalibus, sive in essentialibus perfectionibus. Si Mundum consideremus in suis accidentalibus perfectionibus, poterat esse perfectior; plures enim & clariores in Coelis esse poterant Stellæ; pulchriores flores in Terra; & major intelligentia in homine. Sed si Mundum consideres quoad suas essentielles perfectiones, perfectior esse non poterat; si namque Angelus, v. g. Vel Homo, vel Bestia accresceret, vel decresceret quoad essentielles perfectiones, tunc nec esset amplius Angelus, nec Homo, nec Bestia; illorum nomen mutaretur, sicut mutantur numeri, cum eis additur, velex illis detrahatur aliquis numerus.

Utrum Mundus sit finitus, vel infinitus ?

Est finitus; Deus enim Solus infinitus esse potest, alioquin darentur duo infiniti; quod rationi contrarium est.

Unde derivatur nomen illud Cœlum ?

A verbo Cœlo, quia Cœlum multis  
D                      Stellis

Stellis inſculptum eſt, & Cœlatum.

Utrum Cœli ſint corpora ſimplicia, vel mixta ?

Corpora ſunt ſimplicia; ſi enim eſſent compoſita, v. g. Ex quatuor Elementis, corruptioni forent ſubjecta; cùm autem nullam hætenus corruptionem in Cœlis obſervaverint Aſtrologi, eos non eſſe corpora compoſita, ſed ſimplicia concludendum eſt.

Quid intelligis per corpora ſimplicia?

Intelligo corpora, quæ licet conſtent ex materia & forma, non ſunt tamen corpora mixta, quia mixtio quatuor Elementorum in illis non reperitur. Deus illis dedit formam ita perfectam, ut eorum materia nullam aliam appetat.

Quænam eſt Cœlorum Figura ?

Rotunda; Sol enim, Luna, aliæque Stellæ majores non apparent uno tempore, quàm alio; quod non accideret, ſi Cœli aliam haberent figuram.

*Obji.* Sæpe Sol apparuit major uno tempore quàm alio; & ſic etiam Luna; Ergo Cœlis alia eſt figura quàm rotunda.

*R.* Quando vel Sol, vel Luna major apparuit uno tempore quàm alio; non ideo ſequitur quòd reverà Sol vel Luna fuerit

fuerit major ; id namque accidit propter  
nubes inter nos & sydera ista inter-  
positas ; quæ nubes, velut perspicilia,  
Solent ista corpora nobis representare  
majora.

Sunt ne Cœli animati ?

Quidam sic voluere Philosophi ; as-  
seruerunt enim Cœlos ali exhalationi-  
bus & vaporibus Terræ ; sed hæc opi-  
nio videtur ridicula, quia cùm Cœli  
sint vastissimi & à multis annis creati,  
jam totam terram consumpsissent. Equi-  
dem id non credo, nullam enim in eis  
percipio functionem, vel vitalem, vel  
animalem.

*Obji.* Dixit Aristoteles Cœlos esse a-  
nimatos ; Sic ergo credere possum, quan-  
doquidem hæc tam docti viri fuerit  
opinio.

*R.* Cùm Cœlos fuisse animatos asse-  
ruit *Aristoteles*, tum illos non credidit  
esse animatos eodem modo, quo sunt  
Animalia ; non enim dat eis animam  
informatam, sed assistentem ; credidit  
solummodò Cœlos motos esse ab An-  
gelis.

An Cœli moveantur naturaliter, vel  
Angelorum ministerio ?

*Aristoteles, Divus Dionisius*, & quidam

alij ab Angelis esse motos crediderunt; id enim eorum opinionem confirmabat, quòd nimirum, si quilibet Homo, quilibet Civitas & quodlibet Regnum Angelum habeat ad ejus tutelam, Cœli etiam ob eandem rationem Angelos habere debent.

Ego quidem non dubito, quin naturaliter moveantur; motus enim eorum circularis ita est eis naturalis, propter istam excellentissimam formam, quam Deus dedit eis, atque naturale est aut lapidi tendere deorsum, aut Igni ascendere sursum. Cur enim tot Angelos infumeret Deus ad volvendas istas magnas machinas, quandoquidem hunc illis naturalem motum tribuere potest.

Quot sunt Cœli?

Quidam Astrologi dicunt unum esse tantum, in quo, velut pisces in Mari, locum mutant Planetæ; dum Stellæ fixæ eundem semper ordinem, & motum conservant.

Alij tres Cœlos enumerant; Aerem, quem Psalmista vocat Avium Cœlum; illud Cœlum, in quo moventur Astra: & empyreum, ad quod raptus fuit divus Paulus.

Caldæi & Ægyptij octo numerarunt,  
nempe

nempe septem orbes Planetarum, & Firmamentum, quod primum mobile nominarunt.

Alij, tales fuerunt multi Astrologi Christiani, novem esse dixerunt, scilicet septem orbes, seu Cœlos septem Planetarum, Firmamentum & Empyreum Cœlum, ubi sunt beati Spiritus, & ubi Deus gloriam suam particulariter manifestat; quodque Cœlum cœteros Cœlos, sicut pellis cœpis alias pelles continet.

Alij undecim esse affirmarunt, quippe quia observarunt quòd, præter motum ab Oriente ad Occidentem, qui singulis viginti quatuor horis semper conficitur, alter esset motus & Planetarum & Stellarum fixarum ab Occidente ad Orientem; & quia etiam observarunt tertium motum, quem trepidationis vocant: Ideò undecim esse Cœlos concluderunt.

Hæ sunt differentes Astrologorum opiniones, quæ tibi magis arridebit, eam elige.

Quodnam esse putas discrimen inter Stellæ & Planetas?

Omnes Stellæ sunt in Firmamento, quod dicitur octavum Cœlum; Planetæ

verò sub illo moventur, quilibet diversam ab alijs Sphæram habens. 2° Micant Stellæ, Planetæ, Sole excepto, non micant. 3° Ex se sunt lucidæ Stellæ, Planetæ autem, Sole Solo excepto, mutua à Sole lucem accipiunt. 4° Stellæ semper æqualiter distant aliæ ab alijs; at Planetæ nunc removentur, nunc accedunt, & aliquando conjunguntur.

Quinam est Planetarum ordo?

Hic nempe, si ab inferiori incipiamus. Luna, Mercurius, Venus, Sol, Mars, Jupiter, Saturnus.

Quantum temporis spatium insumunt Planetæ in eorum cursu conficiendo.

Cursum suum perficit Saturnus intra triginta annos vel circiter. Jupiter intra duodecim. Mars ferè intra duos annos. Sol unum annum completum insumit, id est trecentos sexaginta quinque dies & sex horas. Venus & Mercurius ferè eodem tempore ac Sol. Et Luna intra viginti septem dies, septem horas, & aliquot minutas.

Quot sunt Stellæ in Firmamento?

Innumeras esse asserit Scriptura Sacra; *Numera*, inquit, *Stellæ, si potes*. Itaque cum Astrologi mille viginti duas duntaxat enumerant, tum de illis tantum  
men-

mentionem faciunt, quas & per influentias earum, & per constantem lucem norunt.

Quænam est Stellarum magnitudo?

Omnes Astrologi minimam Stellam fixam esse totâ Terrâ maiorem; maximam verò centies septies illius extensionem superare credunt.

An dantur Mundi in Luna, & in Planetis?

Quidam affirmant, & id probabile videtur, Cur enim non erunt Creaturæ in Luna, & in Planetis, sicut videmus esse in Terra & in Aquis. Luna enim & alij Planetæ sunt corpora opaca, & lucem suam à Sole mutuuntur, sicut Terra.

Utrum Corpora Cœlestia influentiam habeant supra Corpora Terrestria?

Ita certè; siquidem videmus quòd, cum Sol calefacit Hemyspherium nostrum, tunc & Plantas producit, & maturat fructus. Videmus quòd, cum plena sit Luna, tum magis vigent Animalia; & quòd eo tempore plus in eis inveniatur cerebri, & medullæ, quàm aliquo alio tempore. Videmus quòd, quando vel seminare, vel plantare, vel scindere

dere ligna, vel colligere fructus, vel purgare Corpora volunt Hortulani & Medici, tunc ipsi Lunas observant. Ab istis experientijs clarè patet Cœlestia Corpora habere influentiam super terrestria.

Quænam est Stellarum, & Solis natura?

Ignæa natura; quando quidem enim illuminent, & calefaciant (quæ sunt Ignis qualitates) inde possumus dicere illis inesse qualitates Ignis.

Quænam est natura aliorum Planetarum?

Cum Planetæ alij nullam lucem habeant præter illam, quam mutuam à Sole recipiunt, ut per Lunam clarè videri potest, naturam Solis habere non possunt, neque eorum naturam possumus determinare, quia formam eorum non videmus. Solummodò dicere possumus eos constare ex materia, Deum que illis dedisse formam ita excellentem, ut & eorum corruptionem impediat, & illis motum attribuat circula-

rem.

Quid intelligis per istas aquas, quas sub, & super Firmamento dicit esse Propheta?

Per Aquas, quas dicit esse super Firmamento, intelligo nubes in Aere existentes,  
ex



ex quibus producitur pluvia; & per Aquas, quæ sunt sub Firmamento, intelligo Aquas super faciem Terræ existentes; & per Aerem, qui medius inter illas invenitur, intelligo firmamentum, quippe quòd est illis instar Firmamenti: eo-que sensu Solem & Lunam esse in Firmamento asseruit Propheta, hoc est, in ista extensione omnia corpora superiora à superficie Terræ usque ad altissimum Cælum continente. Non enim probabile videtur esse Aquas supra Firmamentum, ubi sunt Stellæ fixæ, nam cui forent utilitati nescio.

*Obji.* Supra Cælos esse Aquas asserit Propheta, ergo non intelligit Aerem istum, supra quem generatur Pluvia.

*R.* Phrasim Græcam & Latinam esse conformem Phrasi Hebraicæ, quæ in singulari dicere non potest Cælum, sed Cælos. Quando igitur dixit Propheta Aquas esse super Cælos, idem est ac si dixisset sub Cælo, hoc est, sub Aere; Aer enim hîc sumitur pro Cælo. Hanc ob causam Iris dicitur esse in Cælo, licet sit in Aere. Similiter dicimus Aves Cæli, ut significemus Aves in Aere volantes.

Quid intelligis per vocem istam *Elementum*?

Elementum non solùm significat prin-

cipium alicujus rei, sed etiam materiam, ex qua constat. Sic litteræ alphabeticae a, b, c, &c. Vocantur Elementa, quia sunt principia conjunctionis syllabarum & vocum. Materiam etiam Elementum vocat *Aristoteles*, quia est primum principium corporum naturalium. Per *Elementum* hic intelligo quatuor corpora simplicia, nempe Terram, Aquam, Aerem, Ignem, quæ in compositione rerum omnium mixtarum inveniuntur.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Principium & Elementum?

Principium est substantia imperfecta; Elementum verò est Ens perfectum, quippe constans ex materia & forma; ex quo, quando miscetur cum alijs Elementis, fit corpus mixtum.

Quot sunt Elementa?

Quatuor, Terra, Aqua, Aer & Ignis. Sicut enim dantur quatuor tantum primæ qualitates, nempe Calor, Frigus, Siccitas & Humiditas, sic esse tantum possunt quatuor subjecta istarum qualitatum, *Viz.* Terra, Aqua, Aer & Ignis. 2º Sic probo. Omnia resolvuntur in ea, ex quibus constabant; atqui omnia resolvuntur in Terrem, in Aquam, in Aerem & in Ignem, ergo constabant ex illis.

3º Sic

3° Sic probo. Dantur quatuor humores, Sanguis, Bilis, Melancholia & Pituita; Dantur item quatuor temperamenta, Sanguineum scilicet Biliosum, Melancholicum & Phlegmaticum, quæ quatuor Elementis respondent. 4° Probatur experientiâ; quotidie enim surper Terram ambulamus, Navigamus super Aquas, Aerem respiramus, &, si Ignem Elementarem non videmus, tum quia tenuis est, tum quia distat à nobis, tum etiam propter nubes inter illum & nos existentes, eum tamen in corporibus nostris percipimus.

*Obji.* Ignem Elementarem non videmus, ergo non datur.

Ista consequentia non est bona, inde enim sequeretur non esse Aerem, quia illum non videmus.

*Obji.* 2° Quidquid est luminosum est visibile, atqui Ignis elementaris est luminosus, ergo si daretur Ignis elementaris, foret visibilis.

R. Ignem elementarem non esse luminosum eodem modo atque noster Ignis materialis, qui duntaxat est visibilis propter crassam materiam, quâ nutritur; quia verò Ignis elementaris est purissimus, neque ullâ alitur materiâ, idcirco non est visibilis.

*Obji.*

*Obji.* 3<sup>o</sup> Quilibet Ignis urit; Ignis elementaris est Ignis, ergo urit; atque adeò urit omnia corpora, quæ circa illum versantur.

Distinguo majorem, quilibet Ignis inhærens crassæ materiæ, urit, concedo. Experienciâ enim compertum est quòd Ignis, quò crassiori, & solidiori inhæret materiæ, eò calidior est, & magis urit. Ignis purus & à crasso materia separatus urit, transeat; ergo urit omnia corpora, quæ versantur circa illum; Respondeo hanc consequentiam non esse validam, corpora enim, quæ versantur circa illum, comburi non possunt; sicut cum Ignem in campis accendimus, tum Aerem comburi non dicimus, Aer enim non est subjectum combustionis capax.

Est ne Ignis Elementaris supra Aerem?

Ita; cum enim Terra sit infima, Aquæ sint supra Terram, & Aer supra Aquas, supra Aerem debet esse Ignis Elementaris. Idque experienciâ patet; nam cum Ignis exit ex aliqua materia, tum illum sursum per Aerem ascendere videmus, ut Igni Elementari, quippe centro ejus, se se conjungere possit.

An datur aliquod Elementum purum in hoc Mundo? . . . Si

Si detur, Ignem esse oportet. Certum est Terram non esse purum Elementum; illius enim varietas, generationes, corruptiones, metalla, mineralia, aliaque corpora mixta, quibus tota repletur; contrarium clarè demonstrant. Patet etiam Mare non esse Elementum purum, nam salitura ejus procedit ex mixtione corporum, ut sunt crassæ exhalationes, quæ, cùm altiùs ascendere non possint, Mari inhærent, illudque Salitum reddunt. Aliæ Aquæ, Amnium scilicet & Fontium, non sunt etiam puræ, quippe quæ qualitates Terrarum, per quas transeunt, participant. Constat etiam Aerem non esse purum, propter exhalationes & vapores, quibus condensatur, & quæ à Sole, Luna, alijsque syderibus attrahuntur. Si ergo detur aliquod Elementum purum, Ignis Elementaris esse debet; cùm enim sit supra Aerem, exhalationes & vapores ad illum pervenire non possunt; tum quia si possent, illius calore (supposito quod urat) dissiparentur.

Quænam sunt Elementorum Qualitates?

Calor, Frigus, Siccitas & Humiditas, quæ qualitates vocantur primæ causæ

E

muta-

mutationum in corporibus naturalibus, & quia ex illis dependent cæteræ qualitates, ut levitas, & gravitas; raritas & densitas; durities & mollities; asperitas & lenitas; quas in corporum tactu facile percipere possumus.

Quid est Calor?

Est Qualitas prima, quæ res homogeneas congregat; Sic calor Ignis purgat Aurum & Argentum, congregans quidquid est purum & illud ab impuro disgregans.

Quid est Frigus?

Est qualitas prima, quæ non Solùm homogenea, sed & heterogenea congregat; hoc est, res quæ sunt similes & dissimiles. Sic videmus, quando gelida est Aqua, res diversas simul esse conjunctas.

Quid est Humiditas?

Est qualitas prima, quæ difficilè in proprijs terminis retinetur, sed facilè in alienis. Ut Aqua, Vinum, cæterique liquores.

Quid est Siccitas?

Est qualitas prima, quæ facilè retinetur in proprijs terminis, & difficilè in alienis; ut in omnibus corporibus Siccis apparet.

Quot

Quot sunt qualitates in quolibet Elemento ?

Duæ; Ignis enim est Calidus & Siccus; Aer humidus & calidus; Aqua frigida & humida, & Terra sicca & frigida.

Quænam est ratio cur inter Elementa, alia sunt levia, alia gravia ?

Hoc procedit à qualitatibus, quæ diversimodè reperiuntur in Elementis.

Sunt ne Elementa gravia in suo loco naturali ?

Minime; Si enim aliquod Elementum foret grave, vel Aqua esset, vel Terra. Experientia autem contrarium demonstrat; nam Homines qui natant, & aquam subeunt: Et vermes, Talpæ, Testudines, aliaque animalia, quæ vivunt intra Terram, nullam gravitatem sentiunt, ex eo quòd partes Aquæ & Terræ sint ita simul unitæ, ut se se invicem sustineant.

An Elementorum formæ reperiuntur in corporibus mixtis ?

Ita certè; nam quotidianâ probatur experienciâ, quòd nempe corpora mixta resolvantur in quatuor Elementa. Id etiam patet litterarum similitudine; Sicut enim remanent litteræ postquam

disjunguntur à syllabis & vocibus, ita etiam accidit in Elementis.

*Obji.* Unicum corpus mixtum non potest habere nisi unicam formam; ergo formæ quatuor Elementorum non reperiuntur in mixto, sed duntaxat eorum qualitates.

*R.* Unicum corpus mixtum non potest habere nisi unicam formam completam, concedo; Forma autem completa procedit ex Elementorum mixtione; quemadmodum ex diversorum colorum mixtione novus color apparet.

Est ne Terra punctum respectu Cœlorum?

Astronomi demonstrant eam esse tam parvam partem respectu Cœlorum, ut jure merito puncto comparari possit. Nam si Terra, inquiunt, considerabilem haberet extensionem respectu Cœlorum, cùm Astronomi ex diversis partibus Terræ & Stellas, & earum distantiam ab alijs metiantur, aliquam invenirent differentiam; cùm autem nullam differentiam reperiunt, inde patet Terram, respectu Cœlorum, esse rem minimam. Adde quòd juxta Astronomorum opinionem, licet minima Stella major sit tota Terrâ, tamen non apparet major solido, aut nummo argenteo;



ergo, proportionem servata, Terra respectu Cœlorum minorem habet extensionem.

Est ne Terra mobilis, vel immobilis?

*Copernicus* cum multis alijs asserit esse mobilem, quia rationabilius est Terram moveri, ut Astrorum lumen, & influentias eorum recipiat, quàm ut tot & tanta corpora circa tam parvum corpus moveantur. Sicut rationabilius est & facilius Alaudam vertere propè Ignem, quàm Ignem vertere circa Alaudam. Sed hæc ratio non convincere videtur, quia non difficilius est Cœlis, Stellis & Planetis moveri, quàm Terræ non moveri; quippe cùm Cœlorum natura sit moveri circulariter, sicut Terræ convenit esse in perpetua quiete.

Alij dicunt Terram esse immobilem, quia si foret mobilis, qui saltant, ij nunquam in eundem locum deciderent, quippe cùm Terra moveatur celerrimè. Sed hæc ratio non magis convincit quàm præcedens; partes enim Terræ eundem motum habent atque totum; atqui corpus Hominis est pars Terræ, ergo non mirari debemus, quòd, cùm saltet, eundem habeat motum atque Terra, ac proinde quòd decadat in eundem locum.

Quæ tibi magis arridet opinio, eam elige.

An dantur Antypodes? vel an dantur Homines, qui pedes suos pedibus nostris oppositos habeant?

Hac de re nemo dubitare debet; cùm enim Terra sit rotunda, & in Aere suspensa, ut ab ortu & occasu Solis clarissimè patet; inde sequitur quòd sive per Mare, sive per Terras multi locum oppositum loco, ubi nunc habitamus, visitare possint, ut jam sæpe expertum est: Ergo constat dari Antypodes, quamquam Augustinus cum multis Philosophis contrariam tenuerit opinionem.

*Obji.* Si essent Antypodes, homines in Cœlum caderent; ergo non dantur Antypodes.

*R.* Quòd, quia omnia gravia ad centrum tendunt, idcirco non magis pro illis, quàm pro nobis metuere debeamus; Si enim isti homines cadere deberent, nos ipsi etiam cadere deberemus, imo ipsa Terra, quippe gravior ipsis hominibus.

Quænam est ratio, cur quælibet Terra quoslibet fructus non producat?

Id procedit partim à diverso syderum aspectu, partim ab ipsa Terra, ut pote in uno loco fertiliori quàm in alio; &  
partim

partim à voluntate Divina, cui hæc placuit diversitas, ut nimirum nationes amicitiam inter se servarent, propter auxilium, quod aliæ ab alijs vicissim accipiunt.

Quænam est ratio cur puteorum, & fontium Aqua tepida sit hiberno tempore, æstivo verò frigida ?

Id procedit à Frigore, quod, quia comprimit Calorem in visceribus Terræ, ideò impedit eum, quominus exeat, atque adeò puteorum & fontium Aqua fit calida hieme; æstate verò, quia Terra calefit solaribus radijs, idcirco frigus intra terram recipitur & hæc est ratio, cur Puteorum & Fontium Aqua sit Frigida.

Cur lentius Fluvij fluunt hieme, quàm æstate & cur graviora onera ferunt ?

Id procedit à Frigore, quod, quia Aquam comprimit, eam idcirco densiorem, & minus fluidam reddit, ac proinde capacem ferendi graviora onera.

Cur Aqua calida citius frigescit ad Solem quàm ad umbram ?

Ex eo quòd Aqua calida melius exhaletur in Aere calido, quàm in frigido; Frigidus enim Aer impedit quominus vapores calidi sursum ascendant.

Cur

Cur Aqua cocta citius congelatur quam non cocta.

Quia partes ejus subtilissimas dissipavit Ignis.

Cur colorem non habet Aer?

Quia cum sit medium, per quod objecta videmus, si Aer esset coloratus, omnia nobis apparerent ejusdem coloris atque Aer, quemadmodum rubra nobis apparent omnia, si per vitrum rubrum inspicimus.

Cur, cum Aer sit nubilosus, tum Calor est magis suffocans, quam cum est Serenus?

Id procedit à nubibus, quæ quia sunt densæ, & Aerem onerant, idcirco Calorem deorsum repellunt. Contrà verò quando Serenus est Aer, tunc exhalationes sursum ascendunt, sicque Aerem temperatum relinquunt.

Cur Ignis instar pyramidis sursum ascendit?

Id procedit ex eo quòd subtilissimis Ignis partibus prius ascendentibus, quæ sunt mediocriter leves, eæ medium tenent; & crassissimæ, materiæ inhærentes, hanc ideò figuram componunt.

Cur Ignis subito accendit pulverem tormentarium?

Quia

Quia quæ sunt similia, ea facile uniuntur.

Quare pulvis tormentarius magnū murmur excitat, cū exploditur bombardā.

Ex eo quòd Aer, per calorem Ignis rarefactus, obstacula, quæ illum retinebant, abrumpere conatur.

Cur moderatus Ignis sudorem excitat magis quàm immoderatus ?

Quia immoderatus Ignis materiam sudoris consumit; moderatus verò illam tantū dissolvit : Ob eandem rationem qui nudi ad Solem ambulant, ij rarissimè sudant.

Cur Ignis æstate minùs calescit quàm hieme ?

Quia Calor ejus æstate per Aerem dissipatur; hieme contrà propter Frigus in Igne diutiùs retinetur.

Cur qui valde frigescent, ij dolorem in extremitate digitorum patiuntur, cū ad Ignem accedunt ?

Id procedit è subito transitu unius contrarij ad aliud, qui transitus nunquam fit absque aliqua violentia.

Cur candens ferrum magis urit quàm flamma Ignis ?

Quia, cū sit crassum corpus, idcirco & Calorem meliùs retinet, & illum

illum faciliùs ad actionem applicat.

Cur flamma linteum ex spiritu Vini asperfum non urat ?

Quia flamma, cùm fit tenuiffima, spiritum Vini attingens, illum depascit; Sed linteum non attingit, quoniam ejus particulæ non sunt fatis tenues, ut ab ea moveri possint.

Quid est Meteorum ?

Est corpus mixtum, imperfectum, quod ex terræ exhalationibus, & aquæ vaporibus generatur.

Quid significat hæc vox Meteorum ?

Sublime, seu excelsum ut plurimum significat, quamvis enim dentur Meteora, quæ in concavitatibus terræ generentur, nempe venti; tamen quia major pars eorum in nubibus generatur, ob hanc causam ab illis nomen eorum desumitur.

Quænam sunt Meteora, quæ ex terræ exhalationibus generantur ?

Venti, Fulmina, Cometæ, aliæque Inflammationes in Aere apparentes.

Quænam sunt Meteora, quæ ex aquarum vaporibus generantur ?

Pluvia, nix, grando, ros, gelu, nebulae.

Cur Meteora, quæ in Aere generantur,

tur, neque tamen ex Aere, neque ex Igne generantur.

Quia, cum Aer & Ignis sint corpora tenuissima, & subtilissima, ideò radij Solis, aliorumque syderum pretereuntes deorsum descendunt, donec vel Terram, vel Aquas, quæ sunt solida corpora, inveniunt, ex illis fumos, qui exhalationes & vapores dicuntur, attrahunt.

Quomodo dividitur Aer?

In tres Regiones. In *Infimam*, quæ nos, nostras Domos, Arboreſque altissimas circumdat; ubi & ros & nebulæ, & gelu generantur; nec non istæ Igneæ exhalationes, quæ in Cimeterijs aliquando apparent, & circa equitantes inflammantur. In *Mediam*, quæ incipit ab altissimarum arborum culmine, donec ad altissimorum montium juga ferè perveniat; Ubi tonitrua, fulmina, pluvix, grando, nix, generantur. Dixi *donec ad altissimorum montium juga ferè perveniat*, quia dantur Montes, ut Olympus, & Caucasus, &c. Sub quorum jugo major pars Meteororum generatur. In *Tertiam*, quæ incipit circiter à jugo celsissimorum montium, donec ad superficiem Ignis Elementaris perveniat; ad quem multa Meteora accedere non possunt, sive quia  
tam

tam altè ascendere nequeunt, sive quia, supposito quod illuc ascendant, per calorem Ignis vicini subito consumuntur. Dixi *multa Meteora*, quia multi credunt Cometas in ista regione generari.

Quid significat hæc vox Cometa?

Aliquid crinitum significat, ex eo quòd Cometæ diversos ramos habentes, eminus veluti crines apparent.

Utrum Cometæ sint Stellæ?

Nequaquam; tum quia Stellæ sunt omnes in Firmamento; Cometæ verò infra Lunam, ut Mathematicis Instrumentis demonstrari potest; tum quia Stellæ non consumuntur ut Cometæ, & quia Stellæ semper eundem cursum servant, quod non accidit Cometis.

Quænam est materia Cometarum?

Crassæ & viscosæ exhalationes, quæ, quia sunt bituminosæ, idcirco diutius Ignem retinent.

Suntne Cometæ signa adversa?

Id vulgus putat, sicut & plerique sapientes observarunt. Narrat enim *Iosephus* quòd, paulò ante Urbis *Hierosolima*, destructionem, illic apparuerit Cometa.

Quid est Tonitru & quid Fulgur?

Sunt exhalationes intra duas frigidas  
nubes



nubes inclusæ, quæ, cùm impete erumpunt, & murmur excitant, tum vocantur Tonitrua; Fulgura verò cùm flammam ejiciant.

Cur citiùs fulgur videmus, quàm Tonitru audiamus, licet Tonitru semper præcedat Fulgur?

Quia visus est multò subtilior auditu.

Quinam sunt Fulminis effectus?

Urit, destruit, occidit. Quædam fulmina sic occidunt homines & bestias, ut eorum ossa comburant, nec ullum tamen vulnus foris apparet. Quædam enses aliquando in vagina, & pecuniam in crumena liquefaciunt, nec tamen vagina, nec crumena lacerantur.

Quænam est ratio quòd interdum vestes Fulmen comburat, corpore illæso; vel contrà gladium liquefaciat, vaginâ intactâ?

Cùm nempe exhalationes, quibus constat, quæque sulphur solent redolere, non aliam quàm oleorum naturam participant; adeò ut levem tantùm flammam nutrant, quæ non nisi corporibus combustioni magis idoneis adhæret. Contrà interdum ossa carnibus integris confringere, vel vaginâ illæsa gladium liquefacere potest, si hæ exhalationes

F

maximè

maximè subtiles & penetrantes, Aquæ Fortis naturam habeant, tum enim sine injuria cedentia corpora relinquunt, & quidquid resistit, comminuunt; Sicut Aqua Fortis, durissima metallorum corpora resolvens, vix quicquam agit in ceram.

Quomodo inflammantur Meteora?

Sive per violentiam eorum motus, sive per calorem Solis, sive per Antyperistasis, hoc est per pugnam, & oppositionem frigoris & caloris.

Quid vocas Lanceas, Tela, Trabes, faces ardentes, Columnas, Virgas, Dracones, &c.

Sunt Meteora, quæ, quia ex raris & tenuibus constant exhalationibus, absque rumore inflammantur, & prout eorum materia est vel plus vel minus densa, diversas componunt figuras, ex quibus totidem nomina desumpserunt.

Quænam est causa istarum coronarum, quæ circa Solem, Lunam, aliaque Sydera aliquando apparent; istius Iridis; istorum parheliorum, nec non aliorum objectorum, quæ sæpe videntur in nubibus?

Hæc omnia procedunt à Sole radios suos in nubes oppositas immittente;  
quæ

quæ nubes, prout sunt variè dispositæ, has diversas figuras representant. Nec hoc cuiquam mirum videri debet, quandoquidem per reflexionem visus nostri vel in aqua, vel in speculo faciem nostram videmus.

Quomodo quædam præliorum Simulacra apparent in nubibus?

Cùm nempe variæ nubes in Aere existunt tam exiguæ, ut veluti totidem milites appareant, & unæ in alias decedentes fatis exhalationum involvant ad Ignis globulos ejaculandos, & non nullos sonitus sic emittendos, ut hi milites configere videantur.

Unde derivatur hæc vox *Iris*?

Ab Aere, quia in Aere formatur. Appellatur etiam filia *Taumantis*, seu admirationis, propter admirabiles ejus colores.

Quænam est causa istorum colorum mirabilium?

Dispositio nubis, quæ radios Solis recipiens, istos mirabiles colores representat, qui diversi colores propter diversam Solis reflexionem, in collo Columbæ & Pavonis, nec non etiam in serico bombicino apparent.

Quænam est causa cur *Iris* apparet sub figura *Arcus*?

F 2

Quia

Quia Sol nubem illuminat circulariter; nam quò magis Sol est elevatus super Hemispherium nostrum, eò minor est Iris. Ob eandem rationem manè & ferò umbras videmus majores quàm meridie; cum enim umbra nihil sit aliud quàm privatio lucis, crescere tunc debet quando Sol nos à latere respicit; & quò magis Sol ascendit, eò magis minuitur umbra, ita ut meridie, qui Solem habent perpendiculariter super capita sua, ij umbrâ carent.

Quodnam est Iridis præfagium?

Matutino tempore Pluviam, Seretino verò Serenum tempus prædicit. Deus autem illam nobis dedit in Signum Diluvij amplius non venturi.

An priùs apparebat Iris quàm illam nobis dedisset Deus in Signum Diluvij amplius non venturi?

Ita credo, quia ante Diluvium eadem existebant corpora Cœlestia, eadem influentiæ, eadem exhalationes, ijdem vapores, eadem nubes, atque adeò eadem tunc Irides atque nunc apparebant, sed non erant Signa Diluvij amplius non futuri, quia Deus sic non determinaverat.

Quænam est causa istius viæ lactis,

Etis quam Græci *Galaciam* vocant?

Id procedit à confusa lumine plurium Stellarum, quæ, quia & parvæ sunt, & distant à nobis, idcirco eas nisi cum lumine confuso & subalbo percipere non possumus.

Quænam est ratio, cur *Aetna*, *Vesuvius*, nec non alijs montes frequenter flammam ejiciant?

Quia materia, ex qua constant, est crassa & Sulphurea; cum enim exhalationes in illis inclusæ erumpere conantur, tum per oppositionem aliorum corporum inflammantur.

Quare dantur Fontes, quorum aqua semper est calida?

Quia effluit per venas Terræ Sulphureæ, & ad calefaciendum idoneæ.

Quænam est causa Fontium?

Multi Fontes ab aqua maris per venas Terræ effluentes procedunt; plures etiam in antris Terræ generantur per Aerem, qui ibi condensatur, & in aquam postea resolvitur, idque perpetuò, quia semper Aer ingreditur istas Terræ cavernas, ut videre est in Alpibus, alijsque altis montibus, ubi plures reperiuntur Fontes, quam in alijs locis, ubi non dantur montes.

Quid est Ventus?

Exhalationes calidæ & siccæ, quæ sursum ascendentes, & nubes frigidas invenientes, per Aerem contrarium deorsum repelluntur.

Quare magni Venti Pluviam retinent?

Quia debilior fortiori cedit; nam contrarias qualitates habent Pluvia & Ventus.

Quare Pluvia Ventum cohibet?

Quia Pluvia decidens in Terram, exhalationes, quæ sunt materia Venti, deprimit.

Cur inter Ventos alij alijs sunt Frigidiores.

Id procedit à constitutione loci, unde erumpunt; qui enim flant à meridie, isti sunt calidi; qui verò à Septentrione, ij sunt frigidi; alijs autem plus vel minus temperati, prout clymatibus frigidis aut calidis sunt vicini.

Quot sunt Venti?

Quatuor sunt præcipui, qui ab Oriente, Occidente, Meridie & Septentrione nomen suum desumunt. Videlicet Eurus, Zephyrus, Auster & Aquilo, seu Boreas. Dixi quatuor esse Ventos præcipuos, nam à Nautis dividuntur in sexdecim, & aliquando in triginta duos.

Quinam

Quinam sunt Ventorum præcipuorum qualitates?

Qui flat ab Oriente, is est calidus & ficcus, sicut Ignis; qui flat à Meridie, est humidus & calidus sicut Aer; qui flat ab Occidente, is est humidus & frigidus, sicut Aqua; qui verò flat à Septentrione, is est ficcus & frigidus velut Terra.

Quinam est Ventorum effectus?

Diversus; nam modò extremum Aeris calorem & frigus moderatur; modò Aerem nubibus onerat; modò illis eundem exonerat, eumque ab omni infectione purificat; nunc Navigantes adjuvat; nunc excitat Tempestates; nunc Domos destruit; nunc eradicat Arbores, &c.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Turbines & Ventos?

Nullum aliud nisi quòd Turbines magna cum violentia deorsum flantes, ædificia diruunt, eradicant Arbores, Navium vela dilacerant, frangunt malos, submergunt Naves, & ita fluctus Maris excitant, ut nunc usque ad nubes, eleventur, nunc autem usque ad abyssos deprimantur.

Quænam est causa Terræ motus?

Exhala-

Exhalationes in visceribus Terræ inclusæ, quæ sive quia sunt nimis crassæ, sive quia Terra est nimis unita & compacta, erumpere non valentes, sic aliquando Terram movent, ut Urbes integras evertant, montesque in Mare deduciant.

Cur post Terræ motum ut plurimum accidit Pestis?

Quia exhalationes è Terra erumpentes, ut plurimum Aerem vitiant & corrumpunt.

Quonam tempore sæpius accidunt Terræ motus?

Autumno & vere; quia æstate calor consumit exhalationes; hieme verò illas restringit & condensat.

Unde procedit ista aquarum ebullitio, quam non rarò, licet tempus sit Serenum, in Mari, in Fluvijs & Puteis videre est.

Id procedit à Spiritus, Ventis, seu exhalationibus in visceribus Terræ sub Aquis inclusis, quæ, cum per Aquas erumpunt, tum sic eas ebullire cogunt.

Quid est Echo?

Nihil aliud quàm reflexio Vocis.

Quomodo fit Echo?

Cum alta Voce loquimur, tum Aer



ab ore nostro expulsus loca Aere plena percutit, putà Rupes, Turres, veterasque Domos, quæ instar timpani resonant, verbaque prolata repetunt ; ita ut, si sint multæ Turres, Rupeve vicinæ, tunc plures audiantur Echo; cum hoc tamen discrimine quòd prima altior sit secundâ ; Secunda altior tertiâ, & sic de cæteris.

Unde generantur ista Meteora, Pluvia, Nix, Grando, Ros & Gelu ?

E vaporibus Aquarum sursum per radios Solis, aliorumque syderum attractis.

Quid est Pluvia ?

Nubes, quæ in Aquam resolvuntur.

Quomodo id fit ostendas quæso ?

Vapores Aquarum à Sole, alijsque Syderibus usque ad mediam Aeris regionem attracti, ibi primùm propter frigus condensantur, deinde sive per calorem Solis, sive per ventorum impulsione[m] liquescent & guttatim decidunt.

Cur guttatim decidunt, & non instar torrentis ?

Tum quia nubes paulatim resolvitur, tum quia ab alto decidens per Aeris allicationem secatur.

Unde generantur Nix & Grando ?

Non

Non Solùm è vaporibus, sicut Aqua; sed etiam ab Aere, & exhalationibus à Frigore congelatis.

Cur Nix & Grando dealbantur ?

Quia plurimùm Aeris includunt, qui Aer tum exhalatur, cùm liquefcunt & albedinem amittunt.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Nivem & Grandinem ?

Nullum aliud nisi quòd grando magis quam Nix congelatur.

Quænam est ratio cur æstate, licet multum frigescat in media Aeris regione, nivem super Terram non videmus ?

Quia transiens per inferiorem Aeris regionem, quæ est calida, illic prius liquefcit, quàm ad nos perveniat. Nihilominus super juga montium tunc apparet, quia illic semper frigescit.

Cur æstate videmus aliquando grandinem, & quidem magnam ?

Quia Grando in media Aeris regione à frigore congelata ad nos ante pervenire potest, quàm per calorem Aeris liquefcit.

Unde procedunt ista prodigia, putà Ranæ, Lapides, Ferrum, Sanguis & alia id genus portenta, quæ cùm imbre aliquando decidunt ?

Prout

Prout materia variè est disposita, hæres diversæ cum pluvia generantur. Sed si res sit valde extraordinaria, ad Authorem Naturæ recurrere debemus; Si enim Manna, ut pasceret Israelitas per quadraginta annos decidere voluit super Terram, alia nunc prodigia operari potest, nam non est abbreviata manus ejus.

Quid est Ros?

Parvuli vapores, qui propter caloris defectum altius ascendere non valentes, in parvas aquæ guttas in folijs, & in extremitate arborum renidentes resolvuntur; quod quidem accidit tempore temperato, nam æstate, cum nimium calefcit, Ros per Solis ardorem consumitur; Hieme autem, cum multum frigescit, congelatur.

Quid est Mel?

Parvulus vapor è subtilissimis Terræ partibus constans, quem Apes in herbis & floribus colligunt.

Unde procedunt Nebulæ?

E vaporibus, & crassis exhalationibus simul mixtis; perniciosos aliquando producant effectus, nam super flores, & fructus decedentes, eos penitus sæpissimè corrumpunt.

Quomodo fit Glacies?

Partim

Partim à frigore, & partim à crassis exhalationibus, quæ cum Aqua commiscentur. Si enim Aqua foret pura absque exhalationibus, nunquam congelaretur.

Quænam est origo Fontium, Fluviorum, Lacuum & Stagnorum ?

Mare, quod Aquas suas per Terræ venas effundit, & ut irriget illam, & simul fertilem reddat. Quia autem dantur Montes, in quorum cacumine Scaturiunt Fontes, nonnulli dicunt eos generari ex vaporibus in istis montium visceribus inclusis.

Quænam est causa cur Fontium, Fluminum, Lacuum & Stagnorum aquæ sint dulces, quamquam Mare, unde procedunt, sit Salitum ?

Ratio hæc est quia nempe per venas Terræ transeuntes, illius qualitates recipiunt ; quæ enim aquæ per Terras sulphureas, & bituminosas effluunt, eæ sunt calidæ ; quæ per fodinas auri transeunt, istæ sunt nutritivæ ; & quæ per Terras pingues, & limo conspersas, illæ sunt dulces, & insipidæ.

Quænam est causa fluxus & refluxus Maris ?

Hic est omnium Philosophorum Scopulus ;

pulus; nam inter eos maximus, quoniam causam certam dare non posset, præcipitem, ut aiunt, se dedit in Mare dicens, *quia non possum capere te, cape me.* Tamen ne sim absque ratione dicam illius causam esse Præsentiam Lunæ materiæ Coelestem quæ inter Aeris & aquæ superficiem reperitur, prementis, ut intendit demonstrare *Cartesius* in principijs Philosophiæ parte 4. n. 158.

*Obji.* Si fluxus & refluxus Maris foret ob præsentiam Lunæ materiæ Coelestem prementis, ob eandem rationem in Lacubus & Stagnis reperiri deberet iste fluxus & refluxus, atqui non reperitur, ergo præsentia Lunæ non est vera causa fluxus & refluxus Maris.

R. Lacus & Stagna, quorum aquæ ab Oceano sunt disjunctæ, nullos ejusmodi motus pati, quia eorum superficies tam latæ non sunt, ut multò magis in una parte quàm in alia, ob Lunæ præsentiam à materia Coelesti preman-  
tur.

Quænam est causa Salsuginis Maris?

Alij dicunt, quòd quemadmodum Montes Salis in Terra reperiuntur, sic plures in Mari existant, hancque esse rationem, cur Mare sit Salitum.

Sed *Aristotelis* ratio magis mihi arri-  
det, quemadmodum enim Urina nostra  
acris est, & Salita propter adustos hu-  
mores in corpore nostro existentes, sic  
Mare Salitum est propter exhalationes  
& vapores quæ simul miscentur, & à  
Sole pariter attrahuntur.

Quænam est causa cur Navigantes ad  
Vomitum excitantur?

Id partim à metu procedit, partim  
ab exhalationibus acrimoniosis, quæ, ut  
Medicinæ, ad Vomitum provocant.

Unde generantur Metalla & Lapi-  
des?

Ab exhalationibus & vaporibus in  
visceribus Terræ inclusis, quæ simul  
conjunguntur.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Metal-  
la & Lapides?

Plus Terræ quàm Aquæ participant  
Lapides; contra verò Metalla plus ha-  
bent Aquæ quàm Terræ, ut experienciâ  
patet; Liquefcunt enim & malleari pos-  
sunt Metalla, ex eo quòd in eis multum  
Aquæ congelatæ reperiantur. Lapides  
autem non liquefcunt, sed franguntur  
& teruntur, ex eo quòd multum Terræ,  
cujus proprium est indurescere, reti-  
neant. Nihilominus quia dantur La-  
pides

pides pretiosi, qui liquefcunt & diffolvuntur, id ex eo procedit quòd fint magis aquofi quàm alij.

*Obji.* Metella constant ex his, in quæ resolvuntur; atqui secundum Chymistas in Sulphur & in Argentum vivum resolvuntur; ergo non constant tantum ex vaporibus & exhalationibus, sed etiam ex Sulphure & Argento vivo.

*R.* Licet Metalla in Sulphur & Argentum vivum resolvantur, hoc non impedit quominus constant ex vaporibus & exhalationibus; Sulphur enim & Argentum vivum in vapores & exhalationes resolvuntur.

Quot sunt Metalla?

Quidam Naturalistæ numerant novem, nempe Aurum, Argentum, Succinum, Orichalcum, Æs, Stannum, Plumbum, Ferrum & Chalybem. Alij numerant septem, quæ septem Planetis respondent; Aurum enim dicunt respondere Soli; Argentum Lunæ; Æs seu Cuprum veneri; Stannum Jovi; Ferrum Marti; Plumbum Saturno; Argentum vivum Mercurio. Alij quinque tantum recensent, Aurum, Argentum, Cuprum, Ferrum & Plumbum. Dicunt succinum constare ex mixtione Auri &

Argenti; Stannum esse speciem Aeris; & Chalybem nihil aliud esse quàm Ferrum purgatum.

Quot sunt Mineralia?

Diversæ dantur species, quarum hæ sunt præcipuæ, videlicet Sulphur, Alumen, Vitriolum, Arsenicum, Auripigmentum, Sal, Nitrum, Gluten & Bitumen, quæ Saporem habent. Crystallum & Vitrum, quæ sunt sine sapore, ex quibus alia mediantibus rebus humidis liquefcunt, alia verò mediante Igne Solo.

Quam differentiam ponis inter Mineralia, Metalla & Lapidés?

Mineralia in eo differunt à Metallis quòd non sint tam humida; & à Lapidibus, quia non sunt tam terrena, & simul conveniunt, quòd omnia consistant ex vaporibus & exhalationibus, quorum diversa mixtio varias constituit species.

Cur Magnes trahat Ferrum?

Quia statim atque Ferrum est intra Sphæram activitatis Magnetis, vim ab eo mutuatur, & particulæ striatæ ab utroque egredientes, Aerem intermedium expellunt; quo fit, ut ambo ad invicem accedant.

Cur Succinum, Cera, Resina & Similia



milia paleam, aliaque corpora minuta trahant?

Quia tenues & ramosæ istorum corporum particulæ *Frictione* (quæ ad illam vim excitandam requiri solet) commotæ, per Aerem vicinum se diffundunt, ac sibi mutuò adhærescentes protinus revertuntur, & minuta corpora, quæ in itinere offendunt, secum trahunt.

Quid est Monstrum?

Est effectus naturalis à recta & ordinaria suæ speciei dispositione degenerans. Quemadmodum enim Pictor non semper objectum, quod sibi proposuerat, rectè representat; Sic Natura, propter quædam obstacula, non semper quod ei simile est, representat.

Quænam est causa Monstrorum?

Aliquando ab excessu materiæ procedunt, ut Gigantes; aliquando à defectu, ut Nani; aliquando à mixtione materiæ, ut sæpe accidit in Africa, cum Animalia diversæ speciei simul coeunt; interdum per Solam imaginationem, ut accidit ovibus Jacob, quæ maculosæ fuerunt, quia bibentes objecta variorum colorum aspiciebant; & aliquando Sola Dei permissione, propter causas sibi

notas, quas nobis indagare non licet.

Quid est Anima?

Est principium, quo vivimus, sentimus, movemur & intelligimus. Sunt enim corpora, quæ vitam duntaxat habent, ut Plantæ & Arbores. Alia & vitam sensum habent, ut ostrea. Alia vitam, sensum & motum, ut Equi, Canes, &c. Alia vitam, sensum, motum & intellectum, ut Homo.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Spiritum & Animam?

Hæc vox, *Spiritus*, est æquivoca; nam aliquando sumitur pro spirituali substantia, putà pro Deo & Angelis; interdum usurpatur pro naturali hominis dispositione, nec non pro actionibus animæ ejus, itaque dicere Solemus, hic Homo moderato & pacifico spiritu præditus est; Sæpe sumitur, pro animalibus & vitalibus spiritibus, & sæpissime pro fumo, exhalatione, vento & evaporatione, sic aqua vinaria spiritus nominatur. Sed hæc vox, *Anima*, semper ut priùs illam definivi, usurpatur; & semper habet relationem ad corpus.

Quandoquidem quatuor gradus vitæ reperiuntur in Homine, habetne quatuor Animas?

Unam

Unam tantum habet, sed quæ continet perfectiones aliarum; & quæ, propter organorum indispositionem, non subito omnes suas exercet functiones, sed Solum eo tempore, quo corpus est rite dispositum.

Estne Anima divisibilis, vel indivisibilis?

Hominis anima Sola est indivisibilis ut pote spiritualis; sed anima Plantarum, Arborum, omniumque Animalium est divisibilis, utpote materialis; quælibet enim materia est divisibilis, quia quælibet materia est quanta, omne autem quantum est divisibile.

*Obji.* Cum Caput Hominis amputatur, postquam Anima ejus separatur à corpore, tum membra illius palpitantia videmus, ergo signum est manifestum animam ejus esse divisibilem.

*R.* Quando membra palpitare videntur, id procedit à quibusdam vitalibus spiritibus in membris remanentibus, quæ, donec à frigore extinguantur, hanc movendi corpus virtutem habent.

Ubi est præcipua sedes Animæ?

*Aristoteles* asserit esse in corde, quia est primum vivens, & ultimum moriens; Ego, cum quibusdam Philosophis, dico in cerebro residere, quoniam ibi reperiuntur organa functionum ejus; illic

enim aut circum circa reperiuntur sensus communis, Phantasia, Intellectus, Memoria, visus, Auditus, Gustus, Odoratus & Tactus; licet hic ultimus sensus in qualibet corporis parte resideat.

Quid est Anima vegetativa?

Est principium, quo res dicitur vivere tantum.

Quanam sunt Facultates animæ vegetativæ?

Nutrix, Auëtrix & Generatrix. Nutrix Individua, seu singularia corpora conservat. Auëtrix corpus in justam, perfectamque quantitatem adducit; & Generatrix species omnes conservat.

Quid est Anima sensitiva?

Est principium, quo corpus per se sensus habet.

Quid sunt Sensus, quomodo fiunt, & unde procedit Sensuum distinctio?

Sensus sunt Nervi quidam, qui filorum instar à cerebro ad omnia corporis membra protenduntur, iisque sic annexi sunt, ut vix ulla pars humani corporis tangi possit, quin hoc ipso momento moveantur. Motus autem qui sic in cerebro à nervis excitantur, Animam diversimodè afficiunt, prout ipsi sunt diversi; hæque diversæ mentis affectiones,

nes, Sensus appellantur, qui in externos & internos dividuntur.

Quot sunt Sensus externi ?

Quinque, Visus, Auditus, Odoratus, Gustus & Tactus.

Quid est Visus ?

Est sensus externus quo, mediantibus nervis opticis tunicam, retinam dictam, in oculis componentibus, colores discernimus.

Cur Ægyptij Deum sub figura oculi representarunt ?

Propter similitudinem, quam inter Deum & oculum observarunt; Sicut enim Deus in instanti operatur, sic oculus objecta sua videt in instanti.

Cur dicitur visus omnium Sensuum externorum nobilissimus ?

Primò quia, ut jam dixi, objecta sua licet remotissima videt in instanti. 2º Quia major est certitudo in visu quàm in cæteris externis sensibus. Itaque citiùs illis, qui viderunt, quàm qui duntaxat audierunt, credimus. 3º Quoniam oculi sunt animæ nostræ specula, quippe qui omnes illius passionēs, videlicet amorem, odium, iram, timorem, pudorem, modestiam, &c. demonstrant.

Quodnam est objectum visus ?

Lux

**Lux & Colores.** Lux est qualitas diffusa, qua mediante objecta percipimus; Color autem est qualitas passiva, quæ subjectum suum visibile reddit. Lux per se visibilis est; Color non nisi luminis beneficio. Ut aliquis Lucem & Colorem videat, indiget medio perspicuo illuminato.

Quot sunt Colorum genera?

Duo; alij enim Colores dicuntur veri, ut Color albus, niger, cæruleus, viridis, flavus, &c. Qui Colores dicuntur veri, quia reverà tales sunt absque ulla reflexione lucis. Falsi autem vocantur illi, qui à Sola luminis reflexione procedunt; quales sunt isti, qui apparent vel in Serico, vel in collo Pavonis; quique toties mutantur, quoties diversam Solis reflexionem recipiunt.

Quomodo fit ut Lumen & Colores videamus?

Lumen percipimus & Colores per vim motuum, qui in illa cerebri regione occurrunt, unde tenuia nervorum opticorum fila oriuntur; Sicut per motus nervorum auribus respondentium, sonos dignoscimus.

Cur, cum fricamus oculos, scintillas Ignis percipimus?

Id

Id procedit ab agitatione vehementiæ, quæ capillamenta exigua nervi optici instar violenti luminis cujusdam movet.

Quare non omnes æqualiter vident ?

Id procedit sive ab oculorum indispositione, sive à medio non ritè disposito, sive à locorum distantia.

Quænam est ratio cur duo objecta non videamus, cum tamen duos habeamus oculos ?

Quoniam ambo oculi id tantum faciunt, quod alter eorum esset factururus ; si namque alter oculorum sursum moveretur, alter verò deorsum, tunc duo nobis apparerent objecta.

Quid est Auditus ?

Est externus Sensus, quo Sonos audimus, mediantibus duobus nervis in intimis aurium cavernis reconditis, qui tremulos & vibratos totius Aeris circumjacentis motus excipiunt, sicque Aer membranulam timpani quatit, atque ab horum motuum diversitate, diversi soni oriuntur.

Quot requiruntur ad Sonum ?

Tria, duo corpora se se invicem percutientia, & medium, nempe Aer, qui duorum corporum conflictu frangi debet.

An

An ista tria semper requirantur ad Sonum ?

Minimè ; unum enim corpus aliquando sufficit, sed tunc medium supplet corporis alterius officium : ut evidenter apparet in Sagitta violente vibrata, tunc enim Aer & medium est, & simul corpus percussum.

Quænam corpora sunt ad Sonum aptiora ?

Dura & polita, & quæ multum Aeris continent, ut sunt campanæ, aliaque ex Aere & Argento instrumenta, quæ multo altius sonant quam aut Ferrum, aut Plumbum, aut Stannum ; ista namque molliora sunt, & minus Aeris quam Cuprum & Argentum continent.

Quomodo fit vox Animalium ?

Per fractionem Aeris per Pulmonum respirationem attracti, mediantibus gutture, linguâ, palato & dentibus.

Quomodo dividitur Vox ?

In articulatam & inarticulatam, ut in Logica videre est, *pag. 29.*

Quinam est usus istius viscosi humoris, qui in auribus nostris solet reperiri ?

Ad repellendas quasdam bestiolas, illasque impediendas, quominus auditum lædant.

Cùm



Cùm à tribus milliarijs sonum tormenti bellici audimus, est ne Aer inter tormentum bellicum & aures nostras agitatus?

Hac de re nemo dubitare debet, quomodo enim, nisi propter Aeris agitationem, tremere fenestræ vitro instructæ? & quænam est ratio, cur cùm ventus sit adversus, non omnino, vel certè parum audimus, nisi quia ventus Aerem repellit, illumque impedit quominus ad aures nostras perveniat.

Estne Aqua medium Auditus?

Ita certè; nam ad minimum murmur pisces fugientes videmus.

Quid est Odoratus?

Est sensus externus in naso residens, odores percipiens.

Quid est Odor?

Quædam parvæ particulæ à corporibus emanantes, quæ particulæ satis sunt subtiles, ut in nares attractæ per ossis spongiosi meatus usque ad cerebri nervos perveniant.

Quænam est ratio, cur Arabia, Africa, multæque Insulæ in India sint magis odoriferæ, quàm cæteræ Regionēs?

Quoniam Calor & Siccitas in istis Regionibus prædominantur.

H

Quibus

Quibus medijs diffunduntur Odores?

Aere & Aquâ; quoad Aerem, id cuique patet; & quoad Aquam, id etiam norunt Piscatores, Pisces enim quibusdam odoribus alliciunt, eosque hamo capiunt.

Quid est Gustus?

Sensus externus in linguæ cuspide necnon in Palato residens, quo sapores discernimus.

Quomodo id fiat dic quæso?

Id fit mediantibus nervis qui, per linguam & partes ei vicinas sparsi, à corporum particulis diversimodè moventur, prout ipsorum figuræ sunt diversæ, sicque diversos sapores efficiunt.

Quot sunt saporum genera?

Hæc præcipua, videlicet Dulcedo in melle; Amaritudo in Absynthio; Pinguedo in Oleo; Salsugo in Aqua Maris; in Sinapi Acritas; Asperitas in fructibus non maturis.

Quid est Tactus?

Est Sensus externus per totas partes sentientis corporis diffusus, mediantibus quibusdam nervulis quibus opertum est corpus sensibile, & quibus, utrum corpus palpatum sit calidum vel frigidum, siccum vel humidum, grave vel leve, durum

durum vel molle, asperum vel politum discernimus.

Si manus tangat corpus æquali calore affectum, atque afficitur manus, an illud percipiet?

Non illud percipiet quatenus est calidum; Sensus enim objectum percipit ab eo patiendo; Sed illud percipiet quatenus est vel durum vel tenerum, asperum vel politum.

Quid prodest visus?

Ut non utilia Solùm, sed etiam ut nociva videamus; & ut insuper Cœlestia contemplemur; juxta illud *Ovidij*.

*Os Homini sublime dedit, Cælumque tueri.*

Quid prodest Auditus?

Non Solùm ut utilia sequamur, vitemusque nociva, sed ut etiam Artium & Scientiarum præcepta percipiamus.

Quid proficit Odoratus?

Ut recreet, purificet, & corroboret cerebri spiritus.

Cui usui est Gustus?

Ad discernendum an alimentum, quo utimur in sustentatione vitæ, sit bonum.

Et Cuinam usui est Tactus?

Ut potissimum dignoscamus externas

qualitates corporum, quæ tangimus. Itaque Sensus externi sunt totidem nuntij Animæ nostræ undique nova afferentes.

Utrum externi sensus Hominis antecellant sensibus aliorum Animalium?

Multi id credunt, cùm enim Anima Hominis longè antecellat animæ bestiarum, ejus consequenter sensus excellentiores esse debent. Nihilominus sic in laudem Animalium Scriptum invenimus. *Nos Aper auditu, Linx visu, Simia gustu, Vultur odoratu, præcedit Aranea tactu.*

Utrum objecta violenta nociva sint Sensibus?

Ita proculdubio; nam major albedo nocet oculis; Sic intensior sonus offendit Auditum; Suavior vel putidior odor lædit odoratum; Amariores sapes gustum, & asperiora corpora tactum offendunt.

Utrum externi sensus contraria habeant objecta?

Ita; nam visus albedinem & nigredinem habet; intentum & remissum Sonum auditus; Odoratus suaves & putidos odores; amaritudinem & dulcedinem gustus; & tactus calorem & frigus; Siccitatem & humiditatem; duritiem & mollitiem.

Quot

Quot dantur sensus interni ?

Tres, Sensus Communis, Phantasia & Memoria.

Quid est sensus communis ?

Est sensus internus in anteriori parte cerebri residens, ad quem externi sensus, veluti Nuntij, objecta sua afferunt, ut de illis iudicium ferat. Vocatur sensus communis, quia de omnibus externorum sensuum objectis diiudicat; quamvis enim visus inter albedinem & nigredinem distinguat; inter intentum & remissum Sonum Auditus; Odoratus inter Suaves & foetidos odores; Gustus inter amaros & dulces sapes; & inter duritiem & mollitiem tactus: Nullus tamen ex istis sensibus has omnes simul qualitates distinguere potest, sed duntaxat eas objecto suo convenientes. Id sensui communi Soli proprium est.

Quid est Phantasia ?

Est sensus internus in media cerebri parte residens, non Solum objecta, quæ cadunt sub sensibus representans, sed etiam innumera alia quæ nec unquam fuerunt, nec erunt, ut sunt chymeræ.

Quid est Memoria ?

Est sensus internus in posteriori parte cerebri residens, recipiens simul & con-

servans ideas, seu imagines objectorum, de quibus antea cogitavimus.

Quot habet Facultates Anima Sensitiva?

Duas; Appetitum scilicet & Motum.

Quid est appetitus sensitivus?

Est motio, seu agitatio animæ procedens à cognitione objecti Imaginationi nostræ representati moventis nervos, qui à cerebro ad partes corporis protenduntur.

Quomodo dividitur iste Appetitus?

In Concupiscentem & Irascentem.

Concupiscens procedit ab objecto imaginationi nostræ representato, quatenus est placens sensibus. Irascens autem ab objecto Phantasiæ representato, quatenus adversatur sensibus. Iste Appetitus vocatur Passio.

Quot numerantur Passiones?

Ut plurimum undecim; quoniam objectum, quod consideramus, vel est bonum, ac proinde desiderandum; vel malum, ac consequenter fugiendum. Si bonum, tunc Amorem, desiderium boni amati possidendi & voluptatem in illius fruitione producit. Si malum, tunc excitat odium, evitationem & dolorem, cum accidit. Quod si objectum  
five

sive bonum, sive malum consideretur difficile acquisitu, vel vitatu, tunc Spem, Desperationem, Timorem, Audaciam, & Iram producit.

*Cartesius* plures enumerat; Incipit enim ab Admiratione, deinde numerat *Æstimationem*, Venerationem, Contemptum, Superbiam, Humilitatem, Amorem, Odium, Desiderium, Hæsitationem, *Æmulationem*, Audaciam, Pusillanimitatem, Invidiâ, Compassionem, Complacentiam, Dolorem, Favorem, Gratitude, Indignationem, Iram, Gloriam, Pudorem, Nauseam. Hancque enumerationem facit *Cartesius*, quia cum objectum judicamus esse novum & insolitum tum illud protinus admiramur; & quoniam id prius fieri potest, quam cognoscamus utrum istud objectum sit conveniens necne, idcirco Admiratio videtur esse prima Passio-num; nec ullam habet contrariam, nam si objectum Imaginationi nostræ representatum, nihil habeat in se insolitum, non movet Animam nostram, sicque illud absque ulla passione consideramus.

Admirationem sequuntur vel *Æstimatione* & veneratio, si quam objecto nostro

stro inesse excellentiam putemus; vel contemptus immediatè procedit, si objectum vile & objectum esse judicamus. Et quia objectum nobis inesse potest, & ob hanc causam possumus nos vel æstimare vel contemnere, hinc ideo Superbia vel Humilitas. Et quoniam objectum respectu nostri bonum considerari potest, inde procedit Amor: Si verò ut nocivum judicetur, tunc odium producit. Ex ista consideratione Boni & Mali procedunt cæteræ passiones; & primò Desiderium, quod accidit cum non Solum acquisitionem alicujus boni absentis, & evitationem mali venturi, sed etiam cum conservationem alicujus boni, aut absentiam alicujus mali peroptamus. Quando autem bonum desideratum obtineri posse putamus, hinc spes procedit: Si verò difficile acquisitu concipiatur, inde Desperatio. Quia autem in electione mediorum ad bonum desideratum obtinendum difficultas inveniri potest, inde suspensio mentis, Æmulatio, Audacia & Pusillanimitas procedunt. Et quando nos absque prius deposito dubio ad aliquam actionem determinamus, hinc Syntheresis, seu conscientia vermis. Consideratio boni præsentis



sentis Lætitiam parit, & consideratio mali præsentis Tristitiam. Quòd si bonum consideretur in alio, quem ejusmodi bono indignum judicamus, tunc parit Invidiam; Et, si sit malum, producit compassionem, quæ, sicut Invidia, est quædam Tristitiæ species. Verùm quia causam Boni aut Mali tum præsentis tum absentis considerare possumus; Bonum, quod patravimus, nobis parit complacentiam, Passionum omnium suavissimam; Malum verò Dolorem excitat. Præterea Bonum, quod agunt alij, Favorem affert & Gratitude, si hoc Bonum recipimus; ac simili ratione cùm Malum, quod committunt alij nos non respicit, tum Indignationem Solam causat; & Iram, si nos respicere videatur.

Si autem Bonum, quod est aut fuit in nobis, referatur ad opinionem, quam alij de illo concipere possunt, tunc Gloriam in nobis producit, Malum econtrà Pudorem. Et quia continuatio Boni satietatem gignit, inde Nausca procedit.

Nota quòd hæ omnes diversæ Passiones ad sex reduci possint, nempe ad Admirationem, Amorem, Odium, Desiderium, Gaudium & Tristitiam, quoniam ab istis cæteræ derivantur.

Quid est Admiratio ?

Est subita mentis occupatio circa objectum, quod illi rarum & insolitum apparet.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Amorem & Odium ?

Amor est agitatio animæ à spirituum motione procedens, quæ agitatio incitat eam, ut libenter cum objectis sibi proprijs & convenientibus jungatur ; Odium verò est agitatio à spiritibus procedens, quæ animam nostram inducit, ut libens se separet ab objectis, quæ judicat esse nociva.

Quænam est differentia inter Amicitiam & Devotionem ?

Amicitia respicit Homines & Devotio ferè semper Deum ; dico ferè semper, quia etiam interdum respectum habet ad homines & Patriam. adde quod in Amicitia Amans seipsum præfert Amato, sed in Devotione Amans sibi semper præfert Amatum ; ita ut pro illius conservatione mori non dubitet : Quod videri potest non nullis exemplis hominum, qui, ut & Principum, & Civium vitam conservarent, morti se libentes consecrarunt.

Quid est Desiderium ?

Est

Est agitatio animæ à spiritibus procedens, per quam disponitur ad cupiendam non Solùm possessionem Boni absentis, & conservationem præsentis, sed etiam absentiam Mali tum præsentis tum futuri.

Quid est Lætitia?

Est læta mentis agitatio in possessione Boni, quod ut suum representatur.

Quid est Tristitia?

Est languida Animæ agitatio procedens à Malo, quod Anima, mediantibus cerebri spiritibus, ut suum sibi representat.

Unde fit quòd Lætitia producat in facie vividum, & rubicundum colorem? Tristitia autem ut plurimùm pallidam reddat faciem?

Id procedit ex eo quòd Lætitia aperiat cor nostrum, sicque Sanguis protinus effluat per totas venas, ac consequenter faciem inflans illam reddat sereniorē. Tristitia autem cor restringat; ac proinde Sanguis, lentè fluens per venas, fiat frigidior, sicque pallidam reddat faciem.

Cur Pudor facit ut erubescamus?

Id partim ab amore proprio, & partim à desiderio quandam præsentem infamiam.

famiam vitandi procedit ; & hæc est causa cur sanguis è corde ad faciem ductus reddat illam rubicundam.

Unde procedit Rîsus ?

Ex subita admiratione rei apparentis ut gratæ, quæ inflans Pulmones, Aerem ex illis subitò discedere cogit ; & sic hanc vocem inarticulatam, quæ vocatur risus, producit.

Quænam est causa Lachrimarum ?

Vapores ex oculis effluentes, quorum causa frequenter est Tristitia, quam ab objecto patiente simul & amato recipimus.

Quænam est causa gemituum Lachrimas comitantium ?

Abundantia Sanguinis, qui Pulmones inflans, ex illis Aerem cum præcipatione expellit ; sicque gemitus in gutture parit.

Quænam est causa suspiriorum ?

Tristitia, quæ cor nostrum restringens impedit quominus Sanguis ad Pulmones ascendat.

Unde fit quòd, cùm Comædiæ præsentemur, tum Tristitiam, interdum Lætitiâ, aliquando Odium, non nunquam Amorem, aliasque Passiones sentiamus ?

Id

Id procedit à diversa objectorum representatione nostræ Imaginationi.

Quid est Zelotipia, & quid Æmulatio?

Zelotipia est species metus cum desiderio possidendi aliquod bonum, ita ut levissimas quasque causas suspicionis examinemus, easque ut maximas consideremus. Æmulatio autem est species animositatis, quæ nos incitat ad res suscipiendas, quarum possessionem speramus, quia vidimus eas aliorum votis sæpe successisse.

Quid est Invidia?

Est vitium in mala hominis indole insitum, quia dolore afficitur propter Bonum, quod alijs evenire videt.

Hic non loquor de alijs Passionibus, quia jam de illis in enumeratione præcedenti sufficientem feci mentionem.

Quid est Motus, seu Facultas locomotiva?

Est Potentia, quâ Animal ad imperium appetitus sensitivi se se movet vel ad consequendum quod sibi gratum aut utile apparet; vel ad fugiendum quod noxium videtur.

Ubinam residet ista Potentia?

In singulis corporum partibus.

Quot dantur Animalium genera,  
I qui-

quibus conveniat ista facultas locomotiva?

Sex; Ambulantia, ut sunt Homines; Volantia, ut Aves; Repentia, ut Serpentes; Labantia, ut Limaces; Natantia, ut Pisces; & Saltantia, ut Locustæ.

Quid est Hominis anima?

Substantia spiritualis, quâ Homo vivit, sentit, movetur & intelligit.

Cur illam vocas spirituales Substantiam?

Ut distinguatur à Brutorum anima, quæ, cum sit materialis, corruptioni subiecta est, & simul cum corpore moritur.

Proba animam Hominis esse spirituales?

Anima Hominis est immortalis, ergo spiritualis; nihil enim est immortale præter illud quod est spirituale.

Proba Hominis animam esse immortalem.

Deus & Natura nihil frustra faciunt; atqui Homini innatus est immortalitatis appetitus; ergo Anima ejus immortalis esse debet, alioquin Deus & Natura vanum hunc illi dedissent appetitum.

Probatur 2º Datur justus Deus; ergo Hominis anima immortalis esse debet:

Si

Si namque foret mortalis, injustus videretur esse Deus, quandoquidem in hac vita ut plurimum bonos videmus esse infelices, malos contra beatos. At si quidem id permittit Deus, nulla alia ratio dari potest, nisi quia in altera remunerandi sunt boni, mali contra puniendi; ac proinde eorum anima debet esse immortalis.

Probatur 3<sup>o</sup> à Scriptura Sacra. Corpus Hominis redit in pulverem, & Spiritus ejus ad eum, qui fecit illum.

Ne terreamini ab eis, qui Corpus occidunt, animam autem occidere non possunt.

Latroni, post mortem, Paradisum promittit Christus. Nonnullæ apparuerunt animæ, postquam à corpore separatae fuerunt, ergo sunt immortales. Inde sequitur animam Hominis non esse ex traduce, hoc est, vi seminis, sed immediate à Deo creatam.

Quandonam creatur Hominis anima?

Eo ipso, quo corpori infunditur, juxta illud, quod vulgò dicitur, *Deus animas creando infundit, & infundendo creat*. Quod tum accidit, cum Embrio convenienti organorum apparatu instructus est.

An Animæ humanæ sint eadem in

omnibus Hominibus ratione essentiæ?

Ita; differunt tantum operandi modo, quod discrimen vel ab inæquali temperamento, vel à contracta agendi consuetudine procedit.

Quot facultates habet anima humana?

Tres, Intellectum, Voluntatem & Memoriam, quæ dicitur intellectualis.

Quid est Intellectus?

Est Potentia, quæ omnia intelligibilia concipere, velut tela alba omnes colores recipere, potest.

Unde derivatur cognitio intellectus?

A Sensibus externis; juxta illud, *Nihil est in Intellectu, quod prius non fuerit in Sensu*; Cum hoc tamen discrimine, quod latius pateat objectum Intellectus, quam sensus. Sensus enim tantum versatur circa materialia & singularia: Intellectus autem etiam versatur circa spiritualia; unum insuper infert ex alio, quod sensui non est proprium.

Quot sunt actiones Intellectus?

Tres, Apprehensio, Judicium & Discursus. *Vide Logicam pag. 6.*

Utrum Bestiæ ratione præditæ sint?

Nequaquam; quoniam qui ratione præditus est, is imperat appetitui sensitivo; verum à falso, & vitium à virtute



te discernit; totum in suas partes dividit, & infert unum ex alijs, quæ perfectiones Bestiæ non conveniunt.

*Obji.* Anseres in *Cilicia* super montem *Taurum* volantes, quia à garriendo cohibere se nequeunt, idcirco, ne ab Aquilis illic residentibus detegantur, calculos in rostris suis imponunt; ergo videntur esse ratione præditæ.

R. Quòd, si hæ, & aliæ ejusmodi historiæ sint veræ, id procedat non à ratione, sed ab instinctu Naturæ, qui, quæ sunt utilia & nociva, appetenda vel fugienda, docet.

Quid est voluntas?

Est Potentia Coeca, quâ Homo se ad bonum reale determinat. Dicitur *Potentia Coeca*, quia nihil potest appetere, nisi quod illi ab Intellectu proponitur. Hinc illud adagium, *Ignoti nulla Cupido*.

An voluntas Hominis est libera?

Hac de re non est dubitandum; alioquin vanæ essent Leges ad Hominem cohibendum à vitio; Supervacaneæ forent prædicationes, & sanctæ exhortationes ad virtutem: nec laudari, nec vituperari, nec puniri, nec remunerari deberet Homo, si voluntas ejus non esset libera.

*Obji.* Quidquid Deus prævidet, debet accidere ; atqui suppono quòd Deus præviderit te hodie furaturum ; ergo hodie furaberis ; ergo non est in tua potestate non furandi ; ergo non es liber.

R. Non sequitur te non esse liberum, quoniam providentia Dei non est causa tui furti ; Sed contrà, quia liberè furaberis, furtum tuum est causa, cur Deus illud præviderit.

Quid est Memoria & quid Reminiscencia ?

Memoria, ut jam dixi, est potentia, quâ Homo rerum species, quas antea cognovit, recordatur ; Reminiscencia autem est facultas, quâ per residuum alicujus speciei non oblitteratæ, species oblitteratas renovamus.

Utrum Animalia polleant memoriâ?

Absque ullo dubio. Hirundines enim maria transvolantes ad nidos suos redeunt ; Dominorum domos norunt Canes, Equi, Boves, Oves, Apes, &c. ex cunctis tamen animalibus memoriâ polentibus, Homo omnibus antecellit.

Quid magis proficit ad augendam memoriâ ?

Nonnulla dantur secreta ; sed omnium excellentissimum est exercitium.

Cur

Cur meliùs mane quàm ferò recordamur ?

Quoniam mane cerebrum nostrum vacuum est vaporibus, qui ferò, dum exhalantur per digestionem, memoriæ efficiunt.

Cur mane meliùs historiæ, ferò immediate ante cubitum lectæ, recordamur, quàm cùm illam per diem legimus ?

Id ex eo procedit, quòd historia immediate ante somnium lecta, ab alijs non confundatur speciebus.

Cur, qui celeriter discunt, ij celeriter obliviscuntur ?

Id procedit ab humiditate eorum cerebri species facilè recipientis, nec eas diu conservantis.

Quid est Somnus ?

Est cessatio ab externorum sensuum operationibus, mediantibus vaporibus nervos & meatus sensorios opplentibus, & spirituum animalium influxum impedientibus.

Quare somnus matutinus gratior est quàm ferotinus ?

Id ex eo procedit, quòd nimirum Sol ascendens super Hemyspherium nostrum, suaves istos vapores Somnum pro-

producentes è corporibus nostris attrahat.

Quid est Vigilia?

Est non impeditum omnium sensuum externorum exercitium, animâ spiritus animales ad organa immittente.

Quomodo fit expergefactio?

Cum scilicet vapores à sensorijs meatibus vel à calore cerebri, vel ab externa causa discutiuntur.

Quid est Somnium?

Est apparitio, quæ fit in ijs, qui somno sopiti sunt, ex regressu specierum à memoria ad phantasiam & sensum communem.

Quænam est causa Somniorum?

Ut plurimum res, de quibus per diem cogitavimus; *Ut plurimum* dico, quia sæpe à Deo, & non nunquam ab instigatione Diaboli procedunt.

Quænam est Somniorum significatio?

Vulgò significant quæ sit corporis nostri dispositio, & quæ passio prædominetur in nobis. Qui namque sunt biliosi, jurgia & pugnas somniant; qui autem melancholici, de tristibus cogitant: Aliquando etiam immituntur à Deo, cum nos de realiqua particulari nos monitos

nitos facere cupit ; ut passim in Scriptura Sacra videri potest.

Cur Vere & Autumno frequentius somniamus quàm Æstate aut Hieme ? Et cur tunc magis inordinata sunt somnia nostra ?

Id procedit à vaporibus in Cerebrum nostrum ascendentibus , qui, quoniam Vere & Autumno non tam bene digeruntur, quam Æstate aut Hieme, idcirco species confundunt.

Quæ res vitam nostram diutiùs preservant ?

Benignus Aer ; regimen vitæ ; ciborum & vini usus moderatus.

Quid est Vita & quid Mors ?

Vita est unio animæ cum corpore ; Mors autem nihil est aliud quàm animæ à corpore separatio.

Quænam est causa Morris ?

Variæ sunt ; sed hæ præcipuæ, nempe corruptus Aer, quem respiramus ; immoderatio in cibo & potu ; perversa hominum & mulierum Societas ; sed maximè Peccatum.

Hæ sunt præcipuæ Physicæ quæstiones, quarum clara cognitio Homines in hac vita reddit eruditos.

*Physicæ Finis.*

META-

---



---

# METAPHYSICA.

**U**NDE derivatur Metaphysica ?  
 Ab istis duabus vocibus Græcis  
 μετα & φυσική quæ præter, vel trans  
 Naturam significant.

Quid est Metaphysica ?

Est Scientia Entis, quatenus Ens ut  
 sic consideratur.

Quare dicis *quatenus Ens ut sic conside-  
 ratur* ?

Quia Metaphysica versatur circa En-  
 tia à materiâ separata.

Quodnam est objectum Metaphysicæ ?

Est Ens quatenus Ens, hoc est, merè  
 consideratum ut Ens.

Quomodo dividitur Metaphysica ?

In universalem & particularem. Par-  
 ticularis tractat de Ente in particulari ;  
 universalis autem versatur circa Ens in  
 genere, & circa alia entia transcenden-  
 tia, scilicet unum, bonum, verum, per-  
 fectum, quæ dicuntur entis proprietates.

Quodnam est discrimen inter ista en-  
 tia transcendentia ?

Ens

**Ens** dicitur unum, quatenus est indivisibile; vocatur verum, quando est conforme ideæ, quam de illo rectè habemus; nominatur bonum, prout est desiderabile; perfectum, cùm nihil illi deest.

Quid est Ens?

Est id, quod essentiam habet.

Quid est Essentia?

Est id, per quod Ens est id quod est, & ab alijs distinguitur; exempli gratiâ, humanitas, quæ nihil aliud est quàm animal rationale, est id, per quod homo est homo, & simul distinguitur ab omnibus alijs rebus, quæ sunt in hoc Mundo.

Quid est Existentia?

Est id, per quod res est in actu in rerum Natura.

Quomodo dividitur Ens?

In Ens reale, & in Ens rationis; in univocum, æquivocum, analogum, universale, singulare, necessarium, contingens, in actu, in potentia, finitum, infinitum, simplex, compositum, completum, incompletum, permanens, successivum, abstractum, concretum, absolutum, relativum, accidentale & substantiale.

Quomodo reperitur Ens in nostro intellectu?

Vel

Vel subjectivè, ut quilibet habitus ibi reperitur; vel objectivè, ut sunt omnia, quæ imaginationi nostræ representantur.

Quid est Ens reale?

Est illud, quod absque auxilio nostri intellectus, naturam realem significat; ut homo, qui ex se significat animal rationale.

Quid est Ens rationis?

Est illud, quod non existit nisi in nostro intellectu, ut sunt chymæræ.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Ens univocum, æquivocum, & analogum?

Ens univocum reperitur in multis quoad nomen, & quoad naturam, & de illis æqualiter prædicatur; ut homo respectu Petri, Pauli, &c.

Ens æquivocum reperitur quidem in multis quoad nomen, sed natura illius est diversa, ut Canis respectu terreni animalis, piscis maris & stellæ.

Ens autem analogum reperitur etiam in multis, sed diversimodè participatum; ut sanitas, quæ in homine reperitur ut in subjecto; in medicina ut in causa; & in urina ut in signo sanitatis. Sed de his in Logica fusius.

Quænam est differentia inter Ens universale & singulare?

Ens



Ens universale naturam habet communem multis, non autem ens singulare.

Quomodo vocatur Ens singulare?

Vocatur persona, si sit in natura intellectuali; & suppositum si in irrationali.

Quid est ens necessarium?

Est Ens, quod est semper, & immutabiliter, & quod definere nequit; qualis est Deus Solus.

Quodnam est discrimen inter necessitatem absolutam, & hypotheticam.

In necessitate absoluta res aliter esse non potest, ut verbi gratiâ homo necessitate absoluta animal esse debet. Necessitas autem hypothetica est condicionalis; ut si volueris esse doctus, studere debes.

Quænam est differentia inter necessitatem essendi, & benè essendi?

Necessitas essendi est absoluta, ut homo debet esse sensibilis; & necessitas benè essendi est ad perfectionem tantum, ut homo debet esse doctus & virtute præditus.

Quid est Ens contingens?

Est illud, quod potest esse & non esse.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Ens in actu, & Ens in potentia?

Ens in actu est illud, quod est existens

rerum natura, ut Rosa, cùm florescit, tunc est in actu. Et dicitur esse in potentia, cùm in rosario in germine tantùm existit.

Quænam sunt proprietates Entis in actu?

Duratio, & existentia in aliquo loco.

Quomodo vocatur Entium duratio?

Aut æternitas, aut perpetuitas, aut tempus. Æternitas Soli Deo convenit; Perpetuitas Angelis, animis spiritualibus, & corporibus nostris post resurrectionem; Tempus verò omnibus alijs Entibus attribuitur.

Quot modis Ens dici potest esse in loco?

Quinque modis, definitivè, circumscripтивè, perse, per aliquam ex suis partibus, & mediante re aliqua, cui ad hæret, vel in qua includitur, ut fusiùs videre potes in *Physica*. p. 25.

Quodnam est discrimen inter actum primum & secundum?

Actus primus est essentia rei, ut anima in homine; raciotinatio verò, quæ procedit ab anima, dicitur actus secundus.

Quænam est differentia inter actum purum, & impurum?

Actus

Actus purus dicitur ille, qui ab omni materia immunis est; & est vel infinitus, ut Deus Solus; vel finitus, ut Angelus. Actus autem impurus jungitur cum materia, ut anima hominis unà cum omnibus actionibus ejus, quatenus est unita corpori.

Quam differentiam ponis inter ens finitum & infinitum?

Finitum est limitatum; Infinitum autem limitari non potest. Finitum est dependens; Infinitum independens. Finitum est creatum in tempore, infinitum est increatum & æternum; nempe Deus, isque Solus.

Quid est Ens simplex, & quid compositum?

Ens simplex est indivisibile, qualis est Deus, Ens autem compositum est divisibile, ut Corpus.

Quomodo dividitur Ens compositum?

In singulare, ut est Alexander. In universale specificum, qualis est homo; in universale genericum, putà in animal. In Ens Physicum constans ex materia & forma, quale est corpus. In ens Logicum constans ex genere & differentia, quale est animal rationale; in Ens

Mathematicum, quatenus consideratur ut longum, latum & profundum. In Ens ex subiecto & accidente compositum, putà album; & in Ens ex actu & potentia compositum, qualis est hominis anima.

Quænam est differentia inter Ens completum & incompletum; permanens, & successivum?

Completum habet quidquid desiderat, non autem incompletum. Permanens, ens suum habet simul; successivum, per motum; quales sunt horæ, dies, Anni.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Ens abstractum & concretum; absolutum & relativum?

Ens abstractum est illud, quod concipimus à subiecto separatum; concretum verò denotat accidens alicui subiecto inhærens. Ens absolutum non refertur ad aliud, ut homo; relativum autem ad aliud refertur; ut pater qui refertur ad filium, & magister ad discipulum.

*Nota.* Quodlibet Ens esse vel causam, vel effectum.

Quid est Causa?

Est id, per quod aliqua res producitur.

Quot

Quot sunt Causas?

Quatuor, efficiens, materialis, formalis & finalis. Efficiens est à qua; materialis ex qua; formalis per quam; & finalis propter quam. Exempli gratiâ, Homo ædificans domum, homo est causa efficiens, à quo domus ædificatur. Lapides, ligna, calx sunt materialis causa. Idæa de domo, quam sibi finxit ædificans, dicitur causa formalis. Et habitatio, propter quam ædificata est domus, vocatur causa finalis.

*Nota.* Causam efficientem esse vel per emanationem, ut intellectio respectu intellectus. Vel per educationem, ut ignis respectu filicis, unde educus est: vel per generationem, ut pullus respectu ovi.

*Nota 2<sup>o</sup>* Causam efficientem esse vel univocam, ut homo, quando producit alium hominem, vel æquivocam, ut Sol, quando producit effectus diversæ speciei. Vel universalem, qualis est idem Sol respectu generationis; Vel particularem, qualis est homo; Vel totalem, ut unus homo domum ædificans; Vel partialem, ut quando multi homines simul uniuntur ad unum & eundem effectum producendum; Vel principalem,

lem, & immediatam, ut homo, qui ligna Scindit; Vel instrumentalem & remotam, ut securis; Vel primam, ut Deus; Vel secundam, ut quodlibet agens naturale.

*Nota 3°* Causam secundam efficientem vel esse Physicam, vel Moralem. Dicitur *Phyfica*, quando aliquid reale in effectum suum influit; *Moralis* verò nominatur, quia, licet aliquid reale non influat in suum effectum, tamen talem influentiam habet in animam nostram, ut in productionem effectus aliquid conferre videatur.

*Nota 4°* Materiam esse aut sensibilem & permanentem, ut corpus; aut transitoriam, ut farina, quæ mutatur in panem; Vel remotam, ut Elementa in mixtis corporibus; vel proximam, qualis est materia ipsa in composito.

*Nota 5°* Formam esse vel substantialem, qualis est hominis anima; vel accidentalem, ut doctrina & virtus; Vel genericam, ut anima sensitiva & vegetativa; Vel specificam, ut anima hominis; Vel numericam, ut hæc eadem hominis anima, quatenus est in aliquo individuo considerata.

*Nota 6°* Finem esse aut partialem, ut  
finis

finis partialis Logicæ est rectè objectum aliquod apprehendere; aut totalem, ut rectè discurrere de omnibus rebus; aut proximam, ut pecuniam lucrari in compositione alicujus libri; aut remotam, ut laudem ab hominibus recipere; aut ultimam, ut quærere gloriam Dei, quæ quidem prima esse deberet.

*Nota 7<sup>o</sup>* Quòd Ens relativum sit aut subjectum, aut attributum; & quòd subjectum sit triplex; aut denominationis, ut homo albus; aut inhæſionis, ut idem homo respectu albedinis; aut adhæſionis, ut etiam idem homo respectu vestimentorum.

*Nota 8<sup>o</sup>* Attributum esse vel essentialiale, ut sensibile respectu hominis; vel proprium, ut risibile; vel commune, ut album, nigrum, &c.

*Nota 9<sup>o</sup>* Ens esse aut signum naturale, ut fumus ignem denotans; aut arbitrium, ut hædera appensa Vinum venale significans.

Quid est Accidens?

Est Ens in alio, quod potest esse, & non esse in Subjecto absque ulla subjecti corruptione; ut Albedo vel nigredo in pariete.

Quid est Substantia?

Est

Est Ens per se Subsistens, ut, *v.* Gratiâ, Lapis.

Quid est per se Subsistere?

Est non esse in alio, ut in subjecto.

Quomodo dividitur Substantia?

In completam & incompletam; in primam & secundam; in corporalem & spiritualement.

Quodnam est discrimen inter istas Substantias?

Substantia completa est illa, cui nihil deest; incompleta verò, quæ est pars alterius Substantiæ. Substantia prima dicitur particularis, ut Socrates, Alexander; Substantia secunda dicitur universalis, ut homo, corpus, animal. Corporea constat ex materia & forma, ut lapis, arbor, &c. Spiritualis est expers materiæ, ut Deus, Angeli, animæ rationales.

Quid est Deus?

Est Ens primum, infinitum, immutabile, æternum, independens, omnisciens, omnipotens, omnia videns, qui omnia creavit, eaque conservat & disponit.

An Deus omnia facere potest?

Ita, dummodo res nec sint contradictoriæ, nec essentiæ suæ contrariæ. Deus enim



enim mentiri non potest, quia hoc est essentiae suae contrarium; nec facere hominem irrationalem, quia hoc est contradictorium; esset enim homo & non homo.

Quid est Angelus.

Est substantia spiritualis, immortalis, intelligens, res absque discursu concipiens.

Utrum limitata est Angelorum intelligentia?

Ita; nec enim omnes nostras cogitationes, nec res omnes futuras cognoscunt.

Possunt ne apparere sub corporali figura?

Absque ullo dubio, ut passim in Scriptura Sacra declaratur.

Quomodo dividuntur?

In bonos & malos. Boni dicuntur Angeli & mali vocantur Dæmones, seu Diaboli.

Quid est hominis anima?

Est Substantia spiritualis, rationalis, immortalis. *Vide Physicam, pag. 96.*

*Metaphysicæ Finis.*

# TRACTATUS

## DE

# ASTRONOMIA.

**Q**UID est Astronomia ?  
Est Scientia Astrorum motus, eorumque circulorum.

Quodnam est objectum Astronomiæ ?  
Astra quatenus mensurabilia.

Quod nom est discrimen inter Astronomiam & Astrologiam ?

Astronomia versatur circa Astra quatenus mensurabilia ; Astrologia verò dat rationem de eorum effectis.

Quomodo dividuntur Astra seu Stellæ ?  
Stellæ dividuntur in fixas & errantes. Fixæ sic vocantur, non quia sunt immobiles, sed quia in eorum motu eandem distantiam servant. Errantes autem sic nominantur, quia non semper eandem distantiam servant.

Quot dantur Stellæ errantes ?

Septem,

Septem, videlicet Saturnus, Jupiter, Mars, Sol, Venus, Mercurius, Luna.

Quot sunt Stellæ fixæ ?

Innumerabiles eas esse dicit Scriptura ; Astrologi tamen numerant mille viginti duas tantum, quia in isto Solo numero effectus & figuras observant.

Quomodo illas ab invicem distinguunt Astrologi ?

Per earum magnitudinem & figuras.

Quotuplex est Stellarum motus ?

Duplex, alter est diurnus ab oriente ad occidentem, & in 24 horis absolvitur. Alter est periodicus, vel cuique Stellæ particularis, fitque ab occidente ad orientem.

Quid est Sphæra ?

Est instrumentum, quo syderum motus dignoscimus.

Quid potissimum requiritur ut Astorum motus cuique facilius innotescat ?

Axis immobilis est supponendus, circa quem Sphæra, seu Globi Cœlestes volvuntur.

Quid est Axis ?

Est Diameter à Polis terminatus, circa quem volvuntur Globi Cœlestes.

Quid est Polus ?

Est extremitas Axis.

Quot

118 *Tractatus de Astronomia.*

Quot dantur Poli ?

Duo ; alter Septentrionalis, qui Arcticus ; Alter Meridionalis, qui antarcticus nominatur.

Cur alterum vocas arcticum, alterum antarcticum ?

A Voce Græca ἀρκτος, quæ ursam significat, quia Polus isti constellationi vicinus est ; alter autem Polus vocatur antarcticus, quia illi est oppositus.

Quid intelligis per circulos ?

Intelligo lineas in Globi superficie descriptas.

*Nota.* Quemlibet circulum continere 360 gradus ; quilibet autem gradus continet triginta minutas ; quælibet minuta 30 secundas ; & quælibet secunda 30 tertias.

Quot reperiuntur circuli in Sphæra, seu Globo ?

Sex magni & quatuor parvi. Magni vocantur Horizon, Meridianus, Æquator, Zodiacus & duo Coluri. Parvi nominantur Tropicus Cancrī, Tropicus Capricorni, Circulus Arcticus, & Circulus Antarcticus.

Quid est Horizon ?

Est magnus Circulus Hemispherium superius ab inferiori secans, cujus punctum per-

perpendiculariter inclinans super caput nostrum vocatur Zenith ; alterum verò punctum, illi diametraliter oppositum, appellatur Nadyr.

Quomodo dividitur Horizon ?

In sensibilem & intelligibilem. Primus visum nostrum terminat, Cœlumque in duas partes secare videtur, & diversus esse potest secundum diversa loca, in quibus habitamus ; Secundus autem exactè Cœlum in duas partes dividit.

*Nota* Horizontem esse rectum, cum transit per Polos Mundi ; obliquum, quando poli sunt obliqui ; & parallelum, quando unus polus est in puncto verticali ; idem de Sphæra dicere debemus.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Sphæram rectam, obliquam & parallellam ?

Sphæra recta utrumque Polum habet in Horizonte ; dantur duodecim horæ diei in Sphæra recta & totidem noctis. Dicitur Sphæra recta, quia Sol, Luna, aliaque Sydera Cœlestia per duodecim horas directè ascendunt supra Horizontem, & per totidem horas directè descendunt infra Horizontem ; qui inhabitant sub æquatore, ij Sphæram rectam habent

Sphæra parallela alterum polum ha-  
L bet

bet in Zenith, & alterum in Nadir, lineamque æquinoctialem in Horizonte. In parallela Sphæra à decimo die Martis uſque ad undecimum Septembris, Sole tunc exiſtente in Septentrionalibus Signis, dantur ſex menſes diei in Septentrione, & totidem noctis in Meridie. Contra verò ab undecimo die Septembris uſque ad decimum Martis, Sole tunc exiſtente in meridionalibus Signis, dantur ſex menſes diei in meridie, & totidem noctis in Septentrione. Vocatur parallela, quia Sol, Luna & Stellæ in diurna revolutione horizontis nec aſcendunt, nec deſcendunt, ſed ſemper moventur parallellè.

Obliqua Sphæra dicitur ex eo quòd polos habet obliquos. Qui hanc Sphæram habent, iſti, quando Sol exiſtit in eorum Ecliptica linea, tunc dies habent nocte longiores; contra verò noctes habent die longiores, quando Sol exiſtit in altera linea Ecliptica verſus alterum polum declinante. Sed cùm Sol exiſtit in æquatore, tunc dies æquantur noctibus. In obliqua Sphæra quædam Stellæ ſemper apparent, & quædam nunquam videntur.

Quid eſt circulus meridianus?

Eſt circulus magnus cuilibet loco conveniens,

veniens, & per polos Mundi transiens;  
ad quem cū Sol devenit per diem, tum  
meridiem designat & mediam noctem,  
cū ad eundem pervenit per noctem.

*Nota* Tot esse meridianos, quot inve-  
niuntur puncta verticalia.

Quid est Æquator?

Est magnus circulus in medio Sphæ-  
ræ descriptus, inter duos Polos Mundi,  
ab illis æqualiter distans,

Cur vocatur æquator, seu æquinoctialis?

Quia cū ad illum Sol pervenit, tum  
dies noctibus æquat.

Quot sunt æquinoctia?

Duo, alterum initio Arietis circa un-  
decimum diem mensis Martij; alterum  
in Libra, circa 13 diem Septembris. Pri-  
mum Æquinoctium vocatur vernum;  
alterum, Autumnale.

Quid est Zodiacus?

Est magnus circulus obliquus & latus  
sub quo perpetuò volvuntur Planetæ;  
Eclipticus etiam vocatur, quia ibi Sol  
& Luna, cū conjunguntur & oppo-  
nuntur, tum Eclipsim patiuntur.

Quomodo dividitur hic Circulus?

In duodecim Signa, quæ sic vocantur.  
Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo,  
Virgo, Libra, Scorpius, Sagittarius, Ca-

pricornus, aquarius, pisces. Quodlibet autem ex istis Signis triginta gradus continet.

Quomodo dividuntur hæc Signa?

In Cardinalia, Septentrionalia, Meridionalia, Ascendentia & Descendentia. Cardinalia sunt Aries & Libra, ubi Æquinoctia fiunt; & Cancer & Capricornus, ubi fiunt Solstitia. Septentrionalia dicuntur illa, quæ ab æquatore declinant versùs meridiem, *Viz.* Libra, Scorpium, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces. Meridionalia sunt illa, quæ declinant ab æquatore versùs Septentrionem, nempe Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo. Ascendentia dicuntur illa, quæ à Meridie Tropici Capricorni ascendunt versùs Septentrionem, ad Tropicum Cancræ, *Viz.* Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces, Aries, Taurus, Gemini; in quibus quando Sol apparet, tunc dies increscunt. Descendentia autem sunt quæ a Septentrione Tropici Cancræ descendunt versùs meridiem ad tropicum Capricorni, scilicet sex alia signa, in quibus quandiu Sol manet, minuuntur dies, noctesque increscunt.

Quid intelligis per duos Coluros?

Intelligo duos magnos Circulos & per duos



duos Mundi Polos, & per Cardinalia puncta descriptos, hoc est, per illa puncta, in quibus Æquinoctia & Solstitia fiunt.

Quid est colurus Solstitiorum?

Est magnus Circulus per initia Cancri & Capricorni transiens; qui transit per initium Cancri, circa undecimum diem Junij, is vocatur æstivum Solstitium; Et qui transit per initium Capricorni circa 13 Decembris, hybernum Solstitium nominatur.

Quid est colurus æquinoctiorum?

Est magnus Circulus per puncta æquinoctialia transiens, hoc est, per initium Arietis circa decimum diem Martij; & per initium Libræ, circa decimum tertium Septembris, ut videri potest in his duobus versiculis.

Hæc duo Solstitium faciunt Cancer, Capricornus; Sed noctes æquant Aries & Libra diebus.

Quid est Tropicus Cancri?

Est parvus Circulus, qui junctus est Signo Cancri & per motum Solis in æstivo Solstitio existentis descriptus.

Quid est Tropicus Capricorni?

Est parvus Circulus cum signo Capricorni junctus, & per motum Solis in solstitio hiberno existentis descriptus.

Cur Tropicos vocas Circulos istos?

Ab istis vocibus Græcis ἀπο τὰ τρέπεται, quæ vertere significant. Quia cum Sol pervenit in istam partem Zodiaci, tum vertitur, dies aut longiores, aut breviores faciens; longiores cum in Capricorno vertitur; & breviores cum vertitur in Cancro.

Quid est Circulus arcticus?

Est ille, qui transit per caput ursæ majoris, & Græcè vocatur ἄρκτος, à quo nomen suum desumpsit, sicut & Polus illi vicinus.

Quid est Circulus Antarcticus?

Est ille, qui Arctico opponitur. Isti Circuli vocantur Polares, quia Mundi Polis proximi sunt, à quibus non distant nisi 23 gradibus; Parvi etiam dicuntur, & quia non sunt tam magni quam alij, & quia Sphæram in duas partes inæquales secant.

Quinam est Horizontis usus?

Ortum & Occasum solis, & stellarum ostendere.

*Nota* Solem vel citiùs vel tardiùs oriri, prout super Zodiacum ascendit, vel ex eo descendit.

*Nota* 2<sup>o</sup> Quamlibet stellam oriri dici, cum post solis occasum super Horizonte nostro apparet.

*Nota*

*Nota* 3<sup>o</sup> Quòd illud tempus, Paulo ante Solis ortum, nominetur Aurora; & crepusculum, paulò post illius occasum.

Quinam est usus circuli meridiani?

Ostendere Stellarum altitudinem & elevationem Poli.

Quandonam est major altitudo Stellæ & Solis?

Cùm nempe in medio circuli meridiani apparent.

Quinam est æquatoris usus?

Duo Solstitia, & æquinoctia notare, necnon describere Zonas Cœli & Terræ.

Quot dantur Zonæ?

Quinque, duæ frigidaë, duæ temperatæ & una Torrida.

Ubi sunt Zonæ frigidaë?

Altera est inter Circulum Polarem arcticum & Polum Mundi; altera inter Circulum Polarem Antarcticum & Polum Mundi Antarcticum.

Ubi sunt Zonæ Temperatæ?

Altera inter Tropicum Capricorni, & circulum polarem arcticum; altera inter tropicum Cancræ, & circulum polarem antarcticum; hæ duæ sunt in nostro Hemyspherio.

Ubi est Zona Torrida?

Inter utrumque Tropicum, & ab æquatore

quatore æqualiter dividitur ; dicitur Torrida propter nimium caloris, quem illic habitantes patiuntur.

Quinam est colurorum usus ?

Solstitia & Æquinoctia demonstrare.

Quinam est usus motus Solis ?

Dies & Annos, necnon Anni tempestates numerare.

Quomodo dividitur Dies ?

In naturalem & artificialem. Naturalis dies est spatium 24 horarum, quo durante Sol à puncto meridiei semel deducitur ad idem punctum ejusdem meridiei & sic dies naturalis semper includit noctem. Artificialis autem dies est illud temporis spatium, quo durante Sol remanet super nostro Horizonte, isque dies noctem excludit ; & est vel longior, vel brevior, prout Sol ascendit super Zodiacum, aut ex eo descendit.

Quænam sunt partes diei & noctis ?

Horæ. Hora autem est vigesima quarta pars totius illius temporis, quod Sol quotidie peragit per suam circonvolutionem.

Quomodo numerantur horæ in æquatore ?

Per quemlibet quindecimum gradum, qui vigesies & quater additus triginta sexaginta gradus designat.

Quo-

Quomodo dividitur dies?

In tempus ante meridiem, cum Sol movetur ab oriente ad meridiem; in tempus, quod dicitur meridies, cum nempe sol in meridiano puncto existit; & in pomeridianum tempus, cum sol à meridie ad occidentem movetur.

Quinam est linearum parallelarum usus?

Paralellæ lineæ clymata distingunt, delineanturque circa Globum inter utrumque Polum.

Hæc clymata & longitudinem dierum in qualibet regione, & graduum solis latitudinem ostendunt.

Quid est Clyma?

Nihil est aliud quàm spatium inter duas lineas paralellas comprehensum, sesqui horam alterationis diei denotans; Et quò magis distat ab æquatore, eò longior erit dies istius loci.

*Nota* Quòd inter utramque partem æquatoris dantur 24 clymata, quorum illud, ubi longissimi dies constant 24 diei horis, in latitudine 66 graduum, & 30 minutarum terminatur.

*Nota 2<sup>o</sup>* Quòd per istas lineas paralellas quilibet dignoscere potest in quo clymate posita sit quæcunque Regio; & sic

fic dignoscere longissimum diem cuiuscumque loci, subtrahendo scilicet 12 horas ab æquatore, & addendo illas cum sesqui hora in singulo clymate.

Quisnam est periodicus motus stellarum fixarum & Planetarum?

Ille qui proprius est eis, qui nempe fit ab occidente ad orientem.

In quot annis completur stellarum motus?

In 25818 juxta copernicum & juxta alios in 4900 quod spatium annus magnus platonicus appellatur.

In quot annis completur motus proprius Planetarum?

Saturnus cursum suum complet in 30 annis. Jupiter in 12. Mars in 2. Venus, Mercurius & Sol in uno, quo durante sol duodecim signa Zodiaci percurrit. Luna verò in 28 diebus.

Quot dantur dies in anno?

365 dies; quinque horæ & 49 minutæ.

Quænam sunt anni tempestates?

Ver, Æstas, Autumnus & Hiems; quarum causa est motus periodicus solis, qui, cum signum Arietis ingreditur, tum incipit vernum tempus; cum signum Cancri percurrit, tum apparet æstas; cum signum Libræ, tum Autumnus; & cum

cùm signum Capricorni , tunc incipit hiems.

Quot menses numerantur in anno ?

Duodecim, Januarius, Februarius, &c.

Quot numerantur dies in quolibet mense ?

Ter denos September habet, totidemque November, Junius, Aprilis ; reliquis superadditur unus ; sit nisi Biffextus, viginti Februus octo.

Quantum temporis spatium infumit Luna in motu suo periodico ?

Unum mensem infumit. Mensis autem est spatium temporis, quo durante Luna duodecim signa Zodiaci percurrit.

*Nota* Quòd mensis iste vocetur vel peragrations, vel conjunctionis, vel apparitionis. Peragrations mensis dicitur ille, in quo Luna cursum suum periodicum perficit. Conjunctionis, est illud tempus, quod inter duo Novilunia reperitur, & ordinariè 29 dies continet, & aliquot horas. Apparitionis autem mensis est primus aspectus Lunæ usque dum dispareat, quod spatium temporis ordinariè continet 28 dies.

*Nota 2<sup>o</sup>* Apparitiones Lunæ esse differentes, prout recipit Lumen à Sole.

Quid est Eclypsis Lunæ ?

Est

Est interpositio Terræ inter Lunam & solem, cùm diametraliter opponuntur. Terra enim, quæ est corpus opacum, cùm reperitur inter solem & lunam, impedit quominus Luna lucem suam à sole recipiat.

*Nota* Eclipsim Lunæ evenire semper in plenilunio; solis autem Eclipsis accidit tantùm quando Luna reperitur in conjunctione cum Sole. Verùm quia sol multò major est Terra, idcirco totalis non esse potest solis Eclipsis, sicut fit Lunæ, quippe quæ minor est Terra.

Quot dantur constellationes, seu Stellarum figuræ?

Vulgò numerantur quadraginta octo; quidam tamen Astrologi plures numerant.

Quomodo vocantur?

Quindecim sunt Meridionales, *Viz.* Coetus, Orion, Erydanus seu Nilus, Lepus, Canis major, Canicula, Argo, Hydra seu Serpens, Vas seu Crater, Borous, Centaurus, Lupus seu Leopardus, Ara seu Thuribulum, Corona Australis, Piscis Australis seu marinus. Septentrionales numerantur 21. videlicet Ursa minor, Ursa major, Bootes, Draco, Corona, Ariadnus, Hercules. Cepheus, Lyra, Cignus, Cassiopeia, Perseus, Henicus, Serpens, Serpentarius seu Ophiucus, Sagitta, Aquila, Delphinus, Pegasus, Equiculus, Andromeda, Triangulum. Cæteræ duodecim sunt in Zodiaco, & vocantur Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces.

*Astronomiæ Finis.*



